



A University of Sussex PhD thesis

Available online via Sussex Research Online:

<http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by copyright which belongs to the author.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Please visit Sussex Research Online for more information and further details

US FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD INDIA
AFTER 9/11

MD MASUD SARKER

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the
University of Sussex, for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
American Studies

SCHOOL OF HISTORY, ART HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

MAY 2016

Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis has not been, and will not be, submitted in whole or in part to another University for the award of any other degree.

Md. Masud Sarker

Summary

This thesis provides a critical analysis of shifting US foreign policy toward India. The study covers the period from the end of the Second World War up to the end of the first Obama administration. With Indo-US relations since India's independence in 1947 used as a backdrop, the focus is on policy from the end of the Cold war and, specifically, from the time of the 9/11 attack. The thesis explores, in both conceptual and empirical terms, the reasons for United States growing involvement in the South Asian region and its enhanced engagement with India. The principle aim of the study is to determine whether the ramifications of 9/11 were mainly responsible for present state of Indo-US relations, or whether US policy toward India was driven by the broader changes in international affairs associated with globalisation, among which the rise of China is paramount. The approach taken is a critical historical analysis that has involved review of secondary literature and close examination of a range of primary US and Indian government material, supplemented by field work conducted in the US that involved interviews with policy makers and academics.

This thesis shows that US policy toward India has two major dimensions: the first is the US adaptation of its foreign policy in response to the changed international political climate after the Cold War, a shift in which the question of its relative decline from sole superpower status was critical. The second dimension is India's rise, which has given it growing geo-strategic importance in the 21st century and has created the potential for India to become an essential partner in US attempts to maintain the stability of the international order and its own hegemonic role with this order. The argument of the thesis is that US policy toward India is more one of continuity than change, and that the driving force behind recent Indo-US relations is not primarily the consequences of 9/11, but is rather the result of power shifts within a more globalised world. In this changed context both the US and India have looked for closer, strategic relationships with countries that share their interests. While far from being united in this respect, their interests are sufficiently common so that from the end of the Cold War the US and India have developed a closer partnership. The effects of 9/11 contributed to an environment conducive to this partnership, but they were not the primary factor.

Table of Contents

Summary	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Acknowledgments	viii
 Chapter – One: Introduction	 1-30
1.1 Background	1
1.2 The Argument of this Thesis	4
1.3 The Contribution of this Thesis	9
1.4 Methodology	15
1.5 Literature Review	19
1.6 Research Questions	27
1.7 Structure of the Thesis	28
 Chapter – Two: Historical Background of US Foreign Policy – pre-9/11	 31-69
2.1 Introduction: The Cold War Era	31
2.2 India's Struggle for Independence (1945-47) and The US Relationship to Colonialism	32
2.3 Containment of the Soviet Union: US attitudes to India and Pakistan in the 1950s	35
2.4 Indian Foreign Policy	37
2.4.1 The Nehruvian Approach	38
2.4.2 The Policy of Non-alignment	40

2.4.3 Policy after the Cold War	41
2.5 Historical Background of Indo-US Relations	42
2.5.1 The first Kashmir War, the Truman Administration, and India	42
2.5.2 The Eisenhower Administration	45
2.5.3 The Kennedy Administration and the Indo-China War of 1962	46
2.5.4 The Indo-Pak War (Second Kashmir War) of 1965 and the Johnson Administration	49
2.5.5 The Nixon-Kissinger Approach, the Bangladesh War, and India's First Nuclear Test	50
2.5.6 The Ford Administration	54
2.5.7 The Carter Period and Soviet Intervention in Afghanistan	55
2.5.8 The Reagan Administration	58
2.5.9 George H. W. Bush	60
2.6 Policy Shift under the Clinton Administration toward the Region	63
2.7 Realism and Shifts of India's Policy in Post-Cold War Period	66
2.8 Conclusion	68

Chapter – Three: Conceptual Thinking of the Bush Administration's Foreign Policy in the Wake of 9/11 **70-90**

3.1 Introduction	70
3.2 Bush's Foreign Policy until the Events of September 11	73
3.3 Basic Principles of Bush Foreign Policy – Enunciation of a New National Security Strategy	75
3.3.1 The Policy of Pre-emption	76

3.3.2 American Unilateralism	77
3.3.3 The War on Terror	79
3.4 9/11 and the US Policy Focus on South Asia	80
3.4.1 Recognising India as a Natural Ally, and the Strategic Partnership	81
3.4.2 The Policy of De-hyphenation: No Special Relations with Pakistan	84
3.4.3 Balancing China	86
3.5 Conclusion	88

Chapter – Four: The Bush Administration – Implementation of Policies toward India

91-122

4.1 Introduction	91
4.2 Next Steps in the Strategic Partnership - NSSP: A New Approach	92
4.3 Initiatives and Agreements between the US and India under the Bush Administration beyond the NSSP	94
4.3.1 Ten Years of Defence Relations	94
4.3.2 The Open Sky Agreement	96
4.3.3 Energy, Environment, and Public Health	97
4.3.4 US-India High Technology Cooperation	99
4.4 Expanding Defence Cooperation	102
4.4.1 Military Exercises	103
4.4.2 Arms Sales	104
4.4.3 Civil Space Cooperation and Missile Defence	105
4.5 Counterterrorism, Cooperation and Intelligence	106
4.6 Trade and Economic Cooperation	107

4.7 The Nuclear Deal – Background	108
4.7.1 Implications of the Deal – Benefits for the US and India	110
4.7.2 Debate in India and in the US	114
4.7.3 Critical Assessment of the Nuclear Deal	118
4.8 Conclusion	120

Chapter – Five: The Obama Administration: Conceptual Thinking behind the Policy

123-154

5.1 Introduction	123
5.2 The Environment/Challenges Facing Obama in 2008	124
5.2.1 Bush’s Legacy: Obama’s War (Afghan and Iraq)	125
5.2.2 US Decline	128
5.3 Obama’s Foreign Policy - Views and Vision	132
5.3.1 Multilateralism	134
5.3.2 Non-proliferation – Tenets of Obama’s Nuclear Policy	136
5.3.3 Counterterrorism	138
5.3.4 Relations with the Islamic World	140
5.3.5 Relations with Rising Powers	142
5.4 Obama’s Pivot to Asia: India’s Place in the Setting	144
5.4.1 Obama’s Af-Pak Approach	146
5.4.2 India as a Counterweight to China – Commitment to Supporting India’s Rise	147
5.4.3 Obama’s Policy toward India and Legacies of Gandhism	151
5.5 Conclusion	152

Chapter – Six: Implementation of Obama’s Policies toward India	155-185
6.1 Introduction	155
6.2 Initial Technical Mistakes Made by Obama – Rookie Mistakes led to Strained Relations with India	156
6.3 Divergence of Approaches and Sources of Tensions between the US and India under the Obama Administration	158
6.4 Improved Relations with India as a Rising Global Player	161
6.4.1 Defence Relationships	163
6.4.2 Advancement of the Indo-US Nuclear Deal	164
6.4.3 Strategic Dialogue	167
6.4.4 Obama’s India Visit of 2010 – Announcement of US Support for UN Security Council Membership for India and its Impact	170
6.5 Winding down the Afghan War – Impact	175
6.6 Counterbalancing the Chinese Rise	178
6.7 Inauguration of Modi and the Obama Administration	182
6.8 Conclusion	184
 Chapter – Seven: Conclusion	 186-197
Chapters Summary	186
Comparison of Bush and Obama’s General Conceptual Approaches	189
Assessment of the Similarities and Contrasts in their Approaches to India	192
 Bibliography	 198-248

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank the Almighty who has given me the opportunity and strength to complete this study. I would like to extend my gratitude and genuine appreciation to my supervisor, Professor Stephen Burman, without whose constant help and guidance this study would not have been possible. I am indebted to him not only for his support in the usual sense of a PhD supervisor, but also for his understanding regarding my circumstances, the interruptions that they caused and the impact of this on the time it took me to complete. He helped me in every possible way to make Sussex my home. His critical and constructive views have helped to broaden my perspective in the subject.

I am grateful to my University employer in Bangladesh for granting me study leave to pursue this study for such a long period. I am thankful to the Alumni Association of the University of Sussex for a fund granted for my field trip to the US. I would also like to thank my interviewees in the US for the valuable time taken out of their busy schedules to answer my queries and share their knowledge, experiences and views. I am sincerely thankful to the Student Life Centre for providing me a grant at a time when I was in serious need of it.

I would also like to thank everybody at the Department of American Studies for their warm welcome during my time at Sussex, and the University of Sussex Library for fulfilling my interminable Interlibrary Loan requests. I am sincerely thankful to Kamila Kingstone who provided valuable stylistic and editorial advice at a critical time.

I am deeply grateful to my late father who imprinted on me enthusiasm for knowledge in my childhood. My special thanks to my mother who, now in her 80s, has borne the pain of my long absence. I want to thank my family members, brothers and sisters and special thanks are due to my brother Humayun Kabir, who never let me feel down. I would like to thank my friends whose suggestions, comments and company helped me to boost myself while I was 8000 miles from my home. Special thanks also go to my colleagues, friends and well-wishers including Rita'pa, Professor Azad, Dr. Rafiq, Dr. Hannan, Dr. Sadid, Dr. Nazrul, Dr. Jakir, Jaleel Akhtar, Ali Bayindir, Suhas Basme,

Yavuz, Gabriel, David, Yaqi, Tanvir, Shakil, Mamun, Shams, Punny, Abdullah and many others. Moreover, I am deeply grateful to Dr. Moyeen Khan, a successful minister in Bangladesh, who has always been a source of inspiration during this entire journey.

My greatest debt goes to my wife, Mukta, without whose unfailing support and understanding I could not have completed this study. She provided me with the support I needed and shared the frustrations and joys of my studies. Finally, I feel guilty for not taking enough care of my loving son, Mihran, who came at the time when I was extremely busy with my final drafting. I now aim to spend much more time in his wonderful company.

CHAPTER – ONE

Introduction

1.1 Background

We have an ambitious agenda with India. Our agenda is practical. It builds on a relationship that has never been better. India is a global leader, as well as good friend... my trip will remind everybody about the strengthening of an important strategic partnership. We will work together in practical ways to promote a hopeful future for citizens in both our nations.¹

For thousands of years, South Asia has been the primary route for invaders from different parts of the world. Central Asians, Persians, Arabs and even Greeks from 7,000 miles away have invaded the region. The Aryans from Central Asia invaded after about 1500 BC² through the Khyber Pass in Afghanistan and proceeded to subdue the indigenous people. Then in 483 BC, the Persians conquered the northwest of India. Alexander the Great of Greece abolished the Persian Empire and entered into the extreme northwest of India. In 317 BC, after his death, the Greeks withdrew and eventually left little impact on Indian civilisation.³

After the Greek withdrawal, Alexander's empire was divided between his generals. They fought fiercely with each other until a strong state was established in Bactria. In about 120 BC, India faced a new invader in the form of the Kushan Empire, again from Central Asia, which captured Bactria. Divisions within the empire were a common phenomenon during that period. As a result of division, a new empire was established by Ghandra Gupta early in the 4th century. After that, a number of dynasties like the Hun, the Harshavardana, and the Chola ruled India until the late 10th century. In latter part of 10th century, Turks from Central Asia conquered the Punjab and Afghanistan. Sultan Mahmud (971-1030) of the Turks established the Delhi Sultanate which lasted

¹ President George W. Bush speech before embarking on his visit to India in February 2006, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/p/sca/rls/fs/2006/62422.htm>, accessed on 21 May 2014.

²Burjor Avari in his book *India: The Ancient Past - A History of the Indian sub-continent from c. 7000 BC to AD 1200* maintained that there was no Aryan invasion, but there was a migration of an Indo-European speaking group of nomadic people from Iran and Afghanistan, who called themselves Arya, or the nobles.

³Joshua J. Mark, India, *Ancient History Encyclopaedia*, available at <http://www.ancient.eu/india/> accessed on 6 August 2015.

until the late 14th century.⁴ The Mughal Empire was then established in 1526 at Panipat, northwest of Delhi, by the skilled military strategy and strong artillery of Muhammad Babur (1483–1530). The Mughal Empire had been able to bring Persians, Turks and native Indians together in an extensive empire that survived until British took over.⁵

From ancient times then, the Indian sub-continent appears to have attracted the interest of external powers. Motivations have varied but the pattern has continued to the present. During the ancient period, the outsiders occupied the territory and subjugated indigenous people. In the middle ages the region was first colonised by Muslims and then in the early modern period by Europeans until it came under the control of British. There were many causes for Muslim invasion or conquest but the major reason was the desire to spread Islam. The decline of the Mughal Rule resulted in a power vacuum which led the Europeans to move into the region. The Portuguese were the first among Europeans to come to India by sea, reaching Goa in 1498. By the 17th century Portuguese influence declined and the British and Dutch influence grew.⁶ Europeans were interested in establishing trade and commerce with India. The British became interested in India for two reasons: raw materials and consumers. They ruled the sub-continent for about 200 years until Indian independence in 1947, using the subcontinent's resources for the development of other colonies and to support prosperity at home. US interest in the region does not reflect the same kind of history as that of other powers that had engaged with India before independence. It was India's political independence and the partition of the subcontinent that was the fundamental turning point for US interest.

The region had been considered marginal to the interest of the United States as it had no dependence on South Asian resources; instead its interest and involvement came from the desire to contain international communism and to rein in Soviet expansionism in the area. In terms of geopolitics⁷, traditionally the subcontinent had been considered a

⁴Tim Lambert, *A Brief History of India*, available at <http://www.localhistories.org/india.html> accessed on 7 August 2015.

⁵Barbara D. Metcalf and Thomas R. Metcalf, *A Concise History of Modern India*, Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 14.

⁶Tim Lambert, *A Brief History of India*, *op. cit.*

⁷The term 'geopolitics' was first coined by Rudolf Kiellen, a Swedish political scientist, during the first decade of the 20th century. The traditional meaning of geopolitics is the impact and influence of geography on politics. In international relations, it refers to the study of relationship between politics and geography (human and physical) as they affect the foreign policy of a state. It is an approach to study foreign policy that seeks to understand, explain and even to predict political behavior of international actors in light of a combination of political and geographical determinants. These include demography,

single entity. The creation of Pakistan through partition changed the geostrategic importance of the region to the superpowers. After World War II and throughout the entire Cold War, the subcontinent came to be an object of interest in the rivalry between the US, the USSR and China. Northeast Asia assumed great significance in Washington's calculations but within the South Asian region, the US, despite its preoccupation with Soviet communism, chose not to challenge the Soviet role in India, and this confirmed the relatively low priority Washington gave to relations with India.⁸ Instead the US focussed on two concerns, the Indian Ocean and Pakistan's integrity. But with the end of the Cold War, the whole South Asian region came to occupy greater importance to the US and other developed democracies.⁹

Today, South Asia is a region that stands on the edge of becoming an important economic, political and military power. Its location as a neighbour of Afghanistan, Iran and China, and proximity to the Gulf States and Central Asia, as well as the growing power of its economy makes it not only of interest to the United States but to the rest of the world. Towards the end of the 20th century, the region was still regarded as a relative backwater by the United States¹⁰ but this is now far from the case and this attitude has dissipated. This brief analysis of the history of the subcontinent demonstrates that the region has always been shaped by conquest and imperial subordination. This tradition has been renewed in the post Cold War period with all the great powers, but particularly the United States, taking a renewed interest in India's development.

India's growing capabilities in different fields, however, mean it is no longer the passive recipient of outside influence, but is becoming an active power that is shaping its region and helping to forge a new world order. India now rejects dependence on outside forces whether in the economic, political, cultural sphere. India has begun to overcome its weaknesses as skilled and capable strategic Indian leaders have become able to exploit India's strengths. Growing American strategic interest in India and India's growing strength, due in part to the opening up of its economy, meant that with the end of the

topography, location, size, natural resources, arable land, access to the sea, industrial advancement, military preparedness among other resources and capabilities. .

⁸Dilara Chodhury, *Bangladesh in South Asian International Systems*, Academic Publishers, Dhaka, 1992.

⁹A. Z. Hilali, 'Cold War Politics of Superpowers in South Asia', *The Dialogue*, Pakistan Vol.1, No. 2, April-June, 2006, p.71.

¹⁰Dana Robert Dillon, *Testimony before the House International Relations Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific*, hearing on 'The United States and South Asia: An Assessment of Appropriate US Strategic Objectives in South Asia, including an outline of the Specific Policy Instruments, through which we should achieve our goals', Heritage Foundation, 2005, p. 7.

Cold War both had an interest in and an opportunity for a closer relationship. Not only has the United States had to adapt to a changed world scenario, but India has also come to need US support if it is to develop. This has created a new pattern of mutual involvement that is unique in sub-continental history.

The region consists of eight countries and, although Pakistan and Afghanistan will be discussed in due course, particularly because of their importance as the focal point of the War on Terror, this study will concentrate on India as the most significant actor in the region and the one whose bilateral relationship with the US has the greatest long-term significance. As the largest democracy and having developed its capabilities in various fields, India is in a position to pose particular challenges to the current ‘imperial’ power, the US. Since India is no longer susceptible to conventional imperial domination and yet the US remains keen to play a leading role in world affairs, how these two powers cope with this historically distinctive reality will be the subject matter of this study.

1.2 The Argument of this Thesis

The Post-WWII period is accurately described as the American era of international relations. Certainly, America has occupied a central position in world politics since 1945. Its policies have affected the lives of countless millions thousands of miles from its shores. Israel and the Middle East, Vietnam, Afghanistan, Iraq and very recently Libya are some examples but the record goes back further. History has seen at least 180 instances of the use of US armed forces in different parts of the world during the last century.¹¹ The change in American foreign policy orientation from isolationism¹² to total involvement, and from having no entangling alliances to having multiple alignments in the post-1945 world demonstrated how its interpretation of national interest has changed as its power has grown.

On all significant measures, such as industry, agriculture, finance, commerce, GDP, GNP, per capita income, education, scientific discoveries, technological inventions, techno-scientific manpower, defense, and nuclear capability, the United States is a major force. American ideas, images and artefacts have fired the world’s imagination

¹¹Stephen Burman, *The State of the American Empire: How the USA Shapes the World*, Earthscan, London, 2007, p.10.

¹² There is of course much debate as to whether the US was ever truly isolationist in the 20th century. The term is used here loosely to capture the difference between pre and post World War II foreign policy

and influenced its cultural movements. This not only evoked awe and fear but also regard and admiration and few can doubt that, by virtue of its overarching military, diplomatic, cultural and military equipment and assets, the United States has been the pre-eminent power of the post war era.. For some, this has led America to act as a world policeman, controlling international affairs in the name of maintaining world peace and security.¹³

There is much debate about the meaning of the term ‘policeman’ in this context. Barbara Conry in the late 1990s, for example, used the phrase ‘global leadership’ as a euphemism for world policeman. She argued that global leadership does not mean the US leads the world by example, but rather it has been ‘essentially coercive, relying on “diplomacy” backed by threats or military action’.¹⁴ William Blum in his book *Killing Hope: US Military & CIA Interventions since World War II* showed more than one hundred examples of the US attempting to topple a regime or ruler¹⁵ and in an earlier book, *Rogue State*, he called the US an empire. On the other hand, a leading intellectual figure on the right, Dinesh D’Souza articulated the idea widely held within the US that ‘America is the most magnanimous imperial power ever’.¹⁶ Robert Kagan¹⁷ wrote: ‘And the truth is that the benevolent hegemony¹⁸ exercised by the United States is good for a vast portion of the world’s population. It is certainly a better international

¹³Prakash Chandra, *International Relations: Foreign Policies of Major Powers and Regional Systems*, Vikash Publishing House Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi, 1994.

¹⁴ Barbara Conry, US ‘Global Leadership’: A Euphemism for World Policeman, Policy Analysis No. 267, CATO Institute, February 1997. Available at <http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa267.pdf> accessed on 11 August 2015.

¹⁵ William Blum, *Killing Hope: US Military & CIA Interventions since World War II*, Zed Books, 2003.

¹⁶Dinesh D’Souza, ‘In praise of American empire’ *The Christian Science Monitor*, April 26, 2002, available at <http://www.csmonitor.com/2002/0426/p11s01-coop.html>, accessed 21 February 2016.

¹⁷Although Kagan prefers to be described himself as ‘liberal interventionist’, he came to prominence as a leading neoconservative US foreign policy analyst and commentator. In 1997, he founded, along with William Kristol, the neo-conservative think tank, Project for the New American Century (PNAC). This had considerable influence on the foreign policy of George W Bush, including its strong advocacy of military action in Iraq to remove President Saddam Hussain from power. In 2016, Kagan left the Republican Party and supported Hilary Clinton due to disaffection with Donald Trump’s foreign policy. He now claims a more centrist orientation seeking to articulate foreign policies that are deeply rooted in US history and reflect the views of the majority of Americans.

¹⁸The term ‘hegemony’ is itself subject to much contestation. In international relations, it refers to a form of domination that goes beyond more kinetic forms of power and relies as much on the realm of ideas, ‘soft power in modern parlance, as a means of securing leadership by consent. It implies a sophisticated mixture of consent and coercion. Gramsci explained how in a domestic context a strong economic and social group can dominate a system without maintaining a state of constant fear and that its rule will be more sustainable if it can secure consent of the governed. In the international context relevant to this thesis the term is used to capture the broad spectrum of factors that underpin American leadership of the international order,

arrangement than all realistic alternatives'.¹⁹ Although there is an extensive debate about the character of US foreign policy along these lines, whether the US is aggressive or not in its stewardship, whether it can be fairly described as imperial or not in its period of pre-eminence, is not the main point of our discussion.

Of more importance to this thesis is the extent to which US actions, however characterised, have become more significant in relation to South Asia. Perhaps for the first time, the United States sees India as increasingly important to its core foreign policy interests. By contrast, in the early years after the end of the Cold War, South Asia was a low priority in American foreign policy compared to other parts of the world, particularly the Middle East and East Asia.²⁰ Nevertheless, the end of the Cold War set in train structural changes in the international order which, together with a reorientation of Indian economic policy, were destined to increase the importance of the Indo-US relationship. The end of the Cold War, while not having an immediate or obvious impact, laid the groundwork for a new era in Indo-US relations.

Three significant events in the late 90s moved the region to the front burner of US attention.²¹ These were the explosion of a total of eleven nuclear devices in 1998 by India and Pakistan, the Kargil War of 1999 and President Clinton's visit to South Asia in March 2000.²² In this period, South Asia's regional desires and ambitions began to converge with those of the US.²³ In part this was because the variety of potential disasters that might emanate from the region made South Asia of paramount concern to US policy makers and gave it greater significance than before for international stability and for US grand strategy. Specifically, the rise of politicised Islam and terrorism in the name of Islam increased the strategic importance of South Asia at the end of the 20th century.

¹⁹ Robert Kagan, 'The Benevolent Empire', *Foreign Policy*, No. 111, Summer, 1998, p. 26.

²⁰ Zhang Guihong, US Security Policy towards South Asia after September 11 and its implications for China: A Chinese Perspective, *Strategic Analysis*, Vol. 27, No. 2 April-June, 2003, p. 145.

²¹ Lloyd Rudolph and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph, The Making of US Foreign Policy for South Asia: Offshore Balancing in Historical Perspective, *Economic and Political Weekly*, February 25, 2006, p. 703.

²² Zhang Guihong, US Security Policy towards South Asia after September 11 and its implications for China: A Chinese Perspective, p. 145.

²³ Stephen P. Cohen, *The US and South Asia*, available at <http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/articles/2005/1/01southasia%20cohen/20050101.pdf>, accessed on 4 September 2014.

These trends were accentuated by the 9/11 attacks, which threatened the US sense of security in the same way that Pearl Harbour had done.²⁴ They brought about a major reconfiguration of US South Asia policy, to the extent that some claimed the new century had not started on 1 January 2000 rather 11 September 2001.²⁵ The South Asian scholar Stephen P. Cohen has argued that no part of the world was more affected by the terrorist attacks than South Asia.²⁶ The 9/11 attacks changed South Asian political contours, altered US perspectives on the sub-continent, made a previously marginalised Pakistan a front-line state, and put parts of the US-India agenda on hold. They led the United States to attempt to bring New Delhi and Islamabad together in a common cause for ‘the war against terrorism’. President Bush quickly waived sanctions and extended assistance to both, with Washington intending to establish a more balanced relationship in the region, with a partnership with Pakistan and a strategic relationship with India.²⁷ Although US focus on the War on Terror did not interrupt gradual development of closer US-Indian relations, it did change US and Indian priorities in the short term.

After 9/11, South Asia became a significant security concern for the US because for the first time it was a region that could threaten the security of the homeland for its citizens. It was in South Asia, in Pakistan and Afghanistan, where the success of the US struggle against terrorism was likely to be decided. Richard Boucher argued that America’s success in the region was critically important to US national interests, asserting that ‘September 11th cemented our realization that stability in South and Central Asia was ever vital’.²⁸ One consequence was to give the US an interest in strengthening the political foundation of its relationship with India, in enabling India to play a greater role not only at the regional level but also at the global level, and, more specifically, in engaging India as an ally in checking terrorism. The imperative for the United States to maintain regional stability also enhanced India’s value as a bulwark against another threat of instability, namely the rise of China. The Bush administration saw clearly that a strong, stable and conflict-free India in partnership with US could serve to restrict

²⁴ Stephen Burman, *The State of the American Empire: How the USA Shapes the World*, op.cit., p.12.

²⁵ Zhang Guihong, US Security Policy towards South Asia after September 11 and its implications for China: A Chinese Perspective, p. 154.

²⁶ Interview with Stephen P. Cohen in Washington DC in 7 December 2012.

²⁷ Lloyd Rudolph and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph, *The Making of US Foreign Policy for South Asia: Offshore Balancing in Historical Perspective*, p. 704.

²⁸ Ambassador Richard A. Boucher, ‘Pursuing Peace, Freedom, and Prosperity in South and Central Asia’, *The DISAM Journal*, 2006, p. 55.

Chinese influence in the region.²⁹ This trend was continued by the Obama Administration, which gave even more importance to India and, in the eyes of some, took this as far as side-lining Pakistan, in contrast to Bush who had sought to give equal standing to both.

More broadly, a strong Indo-US strategic partnership became an indispensable component for any US strategy that seeks to minimise future hindrances to American influence in Asia, whether it is terrorism, trade, nuclearisation or the shifting global balance of power. A strong strategic partnership can also enhance US economic growth, and increase cooperation in energy security and climate change. The fact that both states are multi-ethnic and multi-religious democracies provides a strong foundation for convergence of interests on the key issues of the world. India's increasing economic growth will over time lead to its ascent as a global power and to an increasing role in maintaining peace and security in the South Asian region, and this furthers the incentive for the US to ensure that India is a partner rather than a rival.³⁰

Partnership cannot be taken for granted, however, and India's wish to establish a wide range of good relations with many countries has strained, and may further strain in the future, its relationship with US. If we take the example of Iran, the picture becomes clear. Traditionally, Indo-Iran relations have been positive and they began a 'strategic partnership' in 2003, which created great concern for many in the US Congress. There was also concern when New Delhi sought energy resources from Tehran, with high New Delhi officials insisting they were 'fully committed', where Bush strongly opposed any project benefiting Iran. As a result, the United States prevented Indian scientists from visiting the United States, and chemical companies from transferring to Iran WMD-related equipment and other technology for three consecutive years.³¹ Again concern arose when, in April 2008, Iranian President Ahmadinejad visited New Delhi and met with senior Indian leaders, and when the then Indian Finance Minister Pranab Mukherji (later president) declined a request from Washington, while visiting America at the beginning of 2012, not to import oil from Iran.

²⁹Bouton, Marshall M., 'America's Interests in India', *US-India Initiative Series*, Centre for a New American Security, October 2010, p.9.

³⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 5, 11.

³¹K. Alan Kronstadt, India-U.S. Relations, *CRS Report for Congress*, February 13, 2007, pp. 26-7.

The tallest buildings, biggest dams, biggest plane, largest ferries wheel, biggest shopping mall, bestselling movies and most advanced mobile phones are now all being made outside Europe and the US. The world's richest man is not an American and the largest factories are not in the US. Countries that previously lacked political confidence and national pride are now finding it. India has found itself one of those emerging countries.³² US policy toward South Asia since the 1950s was largely one of failure and neglect but events and global trends since the collapse of the USSR have led India and the US to accelerate the process of improving relations because its sympathetic values and political system and its strategic location place India among the most suitable of potential partners for the US as it adapts to the changing world order.³³

The strength and sustainability of their relationship will depend on how their mutual interests converge and on how they overcome their past indifference and hostility. But their current partnership derives from the fact that while New Delhi wishes to be one of the major players in the international political scene, Washington believes that New Delhi has the potential to act as a supporter of the liberal international political order. Although India is in the ascendant, it does not want fundamentally to alter the prevailing world order. Its stance therefore favours a continuing prominent or even dominant role for the US, particularly in a context in which the rise of China will ultimately alter the global balance of power, a development which both India and the US, as Asian powers, have an interest in happening in a restrained and gradual fashion.

1.3 The Contribution of this thesis

This study is distinctive in that it will critically analyse the reasons for US involvement in the region and for its close relationship with India after the September terrorist attacks. It will focus on the period from 2001-2012. Its importance lies in the challenge it offers to the orthodoxy that 9/11 ushered in a new era of international relations. This orthodoxy stems from the fact that, although President Bush had been willing to adopt an 'India First' policy toward the region from the beginning of his administration, the terrorist attacks brought Pakistan back into predominance in US strategic calculations and Bush started treating them on an equal footing. For President Bush, 9/11 changed everything, and not to India's relative advantage, and yet the US developed a very close

³²Fareed Zakaria, *The Post-American World And the Rise of the Rest*, Penguin Books, 2009, pp. 1-3.

³³David. S. Chou, *US Policy Toward South Asia in the Post-Cold-War Era*, Sheng- Chih Book Co. Ltd., Taipei, 2003, p. 27.

relationship with India after the attacks and this continued until the end of the period covered by this study. This thesis seeks to understand why this was the case.

The dominant interpretation of the US/India relationship in post 9/11 suggests that the current state of cordial Indo-US relations are the outcome of 9/11 attacks on US soil. This view is frequently captured in the idea that this heinous attack marked the true beginning of the 21st century rather than the formal date of January 1, 2000. My findings challenge that interpretation and argue that there are two main factors that explain the evolution of US/India relations after 9/11: the first derives from the shifts in power that have been associated with the process of globalization in this century, shifts that have the effect of threatening the single superpower status the US had enjoyed since the end of the Cold War. This is most apparent in the rise of China to something approaching superpower status. The different strategies employed by Bush and Obama to avoid a diminution of US power forms a major part of the argument of this thesis. The second driver of the relationship is India's emergence as a significant power in the international sphere and the attendant appetite to influence developments on the global stage. The fact that India's emergence and aspirations had implications for its possible role as a counterweight to China provided the connective tissue of the US/India relationship.

Among academics who believed that the 9/11 changed everything, Douglas Kellner, Bacevich and Prodromou, McCartney, Hirsh, and Gaddis were prominent. Kellner claimed in terms that in the wake of 9/11 'everything has changed'.³⁴ He went further saying, 'In the context of US politics, 9/11 was so far-reaching and catastrophic that it flipped the political world upside down; put new issues on the agenda; and changed the political, cultural and economic climate almost completely overnight'.³⁵ The role of religion in giving rise to an extreme US reaction to 9/11 is shown by Bacevich and Prodromou who argue that 9/11 allowed President Bush, a man of strong religious belief, able to apply his religiosity to the making of US foreign policy. Bush had declared that 'There is only one reason I am in the Oval Office and not in a bar,' and that was 'I found faith. I found God.'³⁶ The combination of this sense of mission when

³⁴ Douglas Kellner, *From 9/11 to Terror War: the Dangers of the Bush Legacy*, Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, Maryland, 2009, p. 27.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

³⁶ Bacevich, A. J. and Prodromou, E. H., 'God Is Not Neutral: Religion and U.S. Foreign Policy after 9/11', *Orbis*, Vol. 48 No.1, (Winter), 2004, p. 46.

combined with 9/11 enabled President Bush to infuse American foreign policy with a moral passion, indeed a crusader spirit which was lacking before the attacks.³⁷

On a more conventional political plane, although 9/11 was a tragedy, many neo-conservatives saw it as an opportunity to transform US foreign policy. After the attacks, the Bush administration appointed many new neo-cons including Elliot Abrams, Victoria Nuland, the wife of Kagan and Aaron Friedberg in the administration to implement their preconceived vision of a more assertive America.³⁸ Analyzing the response of the Bush administration to nationalistic impulses, McCartney emphasized the great role that the 9/11 played in not only clarifying US nationalism but also in merging with its foreign policy.³⁹ By means of applying the legitimate power of American nationalism to describe the incidents of 9/11, President Bush 'was able to provide a context in which Americans could understand and accept a set of foreign policy goals far broader and more ambitious than a simple response to the immediate attacks would have suggested'.⁴⁰

Hirsh was convinced that the 9/11 had the single most vital effect on American foreign policy since the end of the Cold War. He stated 'The United States was faced with an irreconcilable enemy; the sort of black-and-white challenge that has supposedly been transcended in the post-Cold War period, when the great clash of ideologies had ended'.⁴¹ He argued it was the National Security Strategy (NSS) of 2002 that highlighted the 9/11 as a turning point for US foreign policy by re-conceiving its relations with other main players in the global scene, including Russia, China and India.⁴² The Bush doctrine outlined in NSS provided the rationale for assertiveness abroad, insisting that US would retain massive primacy of military force and demonstrating a 'take-it-or-leave-it unilateralism'.⁴³ Gaddis also argued that 9/11 brought a change in approach to the conduct of US relations with the countries in the world but added another dimension beyond inter-state relations. He stated: 'Neither Bush nor his successors, whatever their party, can ignore what the events of September

³⁷*Ibid.*, p. 47.

³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 53.

³⁹ McCartney, P. T. 'American Nationalism and US foreign Policy from September 11 to the Iraq War', *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 119, No. 3 (Fall), 2004, p. 411.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, p. 400.

⁴¹ Hirsh, M., 'Bush and the World. The Need for a new Wilsonianism', *Foreign Affairs*, (Sep/Oct), 2002, Vol. 81, No. 5, p. 18.

⁴²*Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁴³*Ibid.*, p. 41.

11, 2001, made clear: that deterrence against states affords insufficient protection from attack by gangs, which can now inflict the kind of damage only states fighting wars used to be able to achieve'.⁴⁴ It was this recognition that was in part the inspiration for the War on Terror

It was not only the academics but politicians and commentators, public figures like British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, Paul Wolfowitz, Donald Rumsfeld, Richard Perle who believed that 9/11 changed everything. Tony Blair was the first on television to express sympathy of British as a nation. He said 'A lot of people didn't realise quite how much this changed attitudes in America. For them, it was another Pearl Harbour. It changed everything.'⁴⁵ Wolfowitz believed that 9/11 has changed the world forever.⁴⁶ Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney, Rudy Giuliani and many others believed that the day of 9/11 changed the world. 9/11, and, as Condoleezza Rice put it, 'No less than Pearl Harbour, September 11 forever changed the lives of every American and the strategic perspective of the United States.'⁴⁷

Although the weight of public argument that 9/11 changed everything was substantial, agreement was not universal. Change did not affect every area of foreign policy and some felt that the long-term objectives of American foreign policy remained the same with only their form changing to match changed circumstances. Leffler argues that 9/11:

'...did not change the world or transform the long-term trajectory of US grand strategy. The United States' quest for primacy, its desire to lead the world, its preference for an open door and free markets, its concern with military supremacy, its readiness to act unilaterally when deemed necessary, its eclectic merger of interests and values, its sense of indispensability – all these remained, and remain, unchanged.'⁴⁸

The contribution of this thesis lies in showing that the truth lies somewhere in the middle of these two positions. There were dramatic short-term changes of specific policies, notably in Afghanistan and Iraq and in the War on Terror but at the same time

⁴⁴ Gaddis, J. L., 'Grand Strategy in the Second Term', *Foreign Affairs*, (Jan/Feb), 2005, p. 2.

⁴⁵ Lisa O'Carroll, Tony Blair knew immediately that 9/11 terror attacks 'changed everything', *The Guardian*, 10 September 2011.

⁴⁶ Suzanne Goldenberg, 'The Guardian profile: Paul Wolfowitz', *The Guardian*, 1 April, 2005.

⁴⁷ Melvyn P. Leffler, '9/11 and American Foreign Policy', *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 29, No. 3, 2005, p. 406.

⁴⁸ Melvyn P. Leffler, '9/11 in Retrospect: George W. Bush's Grand Strategy, Reconsidered', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 90, No. 5 (September/October 2011), p. 43.

fundamental security interests and ambitions of the US and indeed its grand strategy were not immediately transformed by the terror attack. The argument of this thesis is that the world order and America's role in it were changing before 9/11, primarily due to the forces we use 'globalisation' as a short hand to capture. These forces are not connected to 9/11 in a significant fashion; they were underway before it and have continued to this day, long after the impact of 9/11 on policy has faded. Indo-US relations were affected by the short term changes but the longer term transformation of the US and of India's role in the world order have had a much greater impact on their relationship in the period examined in this thesis, and these forces remain paramount to this day.

To summarise, my thesis will argue that the driving force behind changing Indo-US relations is not of the events of 9/11, but rather that long term changes in world order have forced the United States to adapt. We are witnessing a global power transition; unipolarity⁴⁹ was giving way in the period of this thesis, although exactly to what was not then and is not now clear. The 20th century was the American century, and the US was particularly dominant in the 90s and early 2000s. But the present century, if it belongs to any region, is more likely to be the Asian century. Global power is shifting from North to South and West to East. Already the world is less American, less Western. The United States wants an orderly transition to a new order and to maintain as much of its power as possible in the new dispensation, whatever its form. A stable and progressive South Asia is essential to this goal, just as it is to India's aspiration to exert more influence on the global stage. Both ambitions are given impetus by the fact that greatest threat to them comes from the adjacent region in the form of the emerging world superpower 'China'. It is this common interest which drives the improvements in US- Indian relations, although, as the thesis will show, these same forces also cause

⁴⁹Polarity in international relations refers to the pattern by which power and influence are distributed in the international system. Unipolarity is one such pattern and the most commonly referred to alternatives are bipolarity, as operated in the Cold War, and multipolarity, as is emerging in today's international system. Unipolarity refers to 'the distribution of power in which there is one state with most of the cultural, economic and military influence'. The US variant is also referred to hegemony (see fn 18 above). Other characteristics of American unipolarity include the fact that it is an interstate system and not an empire, and that, although the US is dominant there remains other nodes of power in the system that compete for influence and so the power of the Hegemon is limited. The British Empire (from the end of Napoleonic wars to the beginning of the 20th Century) is perhaps the best recent example of Unipolarity. American unipolarity succeeded the British but only after the long hiatus of world wars and the Cold War. It is gradually being supplanted by a form of multipolarity, whose main danger is precisely the absence of stability that some claim is associated with the benign hegemony of the American era.

disruptions that lead the path to a harmonious relationship to be less than smooth or linear.

American policy toward the Indian sub-continent has always been motivated by the geopolitical and geo-strategic consideration in the region. Its desire for stability and predictability and maximum influence has led it to seek good relations with the two major countries in the region, India and Pakistan. However, the permanent tension on the sub-continent between powers has meant it has always been very difficult for the US to have good relations with both the countries simultaneously. During the Cold War period the US tilted to Pakistan and with the end of war the balance swung to India. 9/11 led the US to want strong relations with both, although for different reasons but the imperative to fight terrorism in Afghanistan meant that a short term tilt to Pakistan was inevitable. Even in the short term this was not straightforward and it was temporary whereas the implications of the global power shift to the East, which favoured India as a partner, were slower but ultimately more significant. Bringing Pakistan to the front from the backburner exaggerated the dramatic and temporary at the expense of focus long term and deeper trends.

In this context gradual growth of India's importance in the regional and global scene has made it more vital to US interests. India is the largest democracy and has the second largest population in the world after China; it contains roughly 20% world population and by 2040 it is expected to have the world's largest population. From being an aid-recipient country, India has become an economic development partner of the US and other western powers.⁵⁰ During the Cold War and in few years of the Cold War ended, New Delhi had hardly strategic importance to Washington, policy-makers in the United States now has started regarding India not just a fellow democracy but a nation with a great strategic interests. Washington not only saw India's rise as modest but having positive influence in solving problems the countries of Asia undergoing.⁵¹ For Schaffer, the United States looking for its deeper relationship with India not because of the changes made due to 9/11 but of India's rise, and it wanted to base its policy directing India on objectives which include deliberate attempt to avoid nuclear war in the sub-continent, India's role as a balancer not to China only but to larger Asia, and the

⁵⁰Teresita C. Schaffer, *India and the United States in the 21st Century: Reinventing Partnership*, CSIS, 2009, p.1.

⁵¹*Ibid.*, pp. 11, 13.

potential of its trade and investment.⁵² Washington and New Delhi has been developing a partnership from the end of the Cold War. India's outward-oriented and promising economy began after the Cold War, leading not just the US but also the rest of the world to recognise India as a major power and to seek closer relations with it.

In sum the evolution of the Indo-US relationship is the product of changes in the global situation. At least until the end of the Cold War, and perhaps right up to 9/11 US relations with India were not as close as those with Pakistan and 9/11 accentuated the difference. 9/11 did create a new dynamic and new dilemmas for the US but the factors underpinning its changing relations with India are wider and more long term than the impact of 9/11. The contribution of this thesis will be to demonstrate the balance between the short-term imperatives that 9/11 gave rise to and the longer-term structural changes driven by changes in world global geo-economics⁵³ and geo-politics. My argument will be that, if there had been no 9/11, the Indo-US relationship would still have been one of gradual development in a positive direction. Although 9/11 was significant, it has not been the deciding factor governing the development of the US-India relationship in the long first decade of the 21st century.

1.4 Methodology

My study is a contemporary historical narrative of US foreign policy toward India since 9/11. In seeking to establish which methods are most appropriate to the study we may think of the possibilities as lying on a continuum: At one end lies the employment of general social scientific theories from which can be developed testable hypotheses with the objective of generating evidence-based conclusions, which, if not universal or law-like, are applicable across a wide range of time and space. At the other end lies historical research that takes as its object the understanding of specific phenomena and eschews the development of more general propositions in favour of deeper understanding of the events under consideration. This study lies towards the latter,

⁵²*Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁵³The term 'geo-economics' is relatively new and appeared in the dictionary in 1990, first used by an American commentator, Edward Luttwak. Closely linked to geopolitics it 'refers to the application of economic means of power by states so as to realize strategic objectives'. Some argue it has the capacity to surpass military strength as an instrument of state power because its components such as investment policy, trade policy, financial and monetary policy, economic and financial sanctions, energy and commodities are more central over time to the lives of the world's populations than intermittent outbreaks of violent conflict. Although there will always be an interplay between geo-economics, geopolitics and security strategy, the biggest single change in the international system in recent years, namely the rise of China has been led by geo-economics and illustrates the ways in which this might be true.

historical end of the spectrum. It does not rely heavily on the application of the approaches prominent in international relations such as constructivism⁵⁴ or realism⁵⁵, or depend on associated formal modelling or a focus on quantitative data. Rather it seeks to find evidence that generates a deep understanding of the relationship whose recent evolution is its specific and sole object of study. In the nature of a continuum there are overlaps in the methods of collecting evidence in both social scientific and historical approaches, even when the object of the research is quite different. This applies to the use of official documents for example but also to interviewing and this study has generated evidence from a set of semi-structured interviews, a method that is as applicable in international relations as in contemporary history. But a distinction between the two perspectives may be seen from the example of the case study. These are employed in both historical and social scientific research but this study is not conceived of as a case study as it is not intended to illustrate or confirm wider theories in international relations.

It would be misleading, however, to present this thesis as a theoretical or lacking a conceptual apparatus. The argument used to explain the primary drivers of the US/India relationship refer to developments and theories within global political economy⁵⁶ and strategic analysis⁵⁷ and security studies⁵⁸ that go beyond the direct relationship between

⁵⁴In this context, constructivism is a theory about how people learn. Starting from the premise that human beings are the active creators of their own knowledge, in international politics. It argues that relations are not determined by unchanging human nature or immutable social structures but they are historically and socially constructed and by virtue of this they are open to change. Given its policy orientation the constructions of leading policy-making actors are part of the framework of this thesis but the focus is on the evolution of the structural context in which they operate and which shapes their construction of context and objectives.

⁵⁵Realism in this context is taken to refer to a stress in international affairs on power politics and the pursuit of national interests, as opposed to the idea that international relations can be guided by ideals and morality and, moreover, that the priority given to the pursuit of power and maximisation of interest is grounded in human nature and therefore carries a sense of inevitability. This leads to a focus on the state as the most important actor in international affairs and as the focus of the thesis is on the inter-state relationship between the US and India that framework is relevant. However this thesis focuses more on the constraints posed by the international system than by human nature and in that sense it falls within a more neorealist perspective. The premise of neo-realism that it is the anarchy of the international system which constrains state behavior is however too general to have much relevance to this study which, although it can draw on neorealist perspectives does not, as stated in the text, seek to take its subject matter as a case study to support or contradict neo-realist theory.

⁵⁶Global political economy and international political economy are used interchangeably. Although the former arguably has a more comprehensive connotation both will be used to refer to the interaction between political and economic forces that are reshaping domestic societies as well as relations between states.

⁵⁷Strategic analysis refers to the processes by which an agent seeks to achieve a specific policy objective. It is an assessment of how different aspects of policy-making interact to determine its success. It provides a crystallized view of the objectives, goals of any organization/state, and the means to achieve them within a specific timeframe.

the two countries, and which are themselves the product of social scientific analysis. The point is that, while ideas and evidence from these fields is used in this thesis, this is done in order to illuminate the relationship under consideration rather than that relationship being used to illustrate some broader theory in the field of international political economy or security studies or another sub-field of international relations. Neither is evidence marshalled, for example, to demonstrate the efficacy of a realist or constructivist approach.

In order to avoid a charge of excessive eclecticism that this description might prompt, discipline in the methodological approach used here is provided by the character of the thesis as a policy study. This is not to place it in the field of foreign policy analysis⁵⁹ insofar as that is associated with the study of state institutions and the policy making process. But it is to suggest that the selection of ideas used to inform the analysis of the available primary and secondary sources is governed by their efficacy in fostering understanding of the concerns of leading actors charged with advancing their conception of national interests, understanding also the external forces that play upon this process and then of analysing the evolution of policy outcomes that are the product of the interaction of these forces.

The study will use a variety of primary and secondary sources. Much of the information is available from online sources, including from the White House, US State Department, Department of Defence and other government agencies. As a part of secondary source, other than books, journal articles, the author also will use numerous PhD theses of previous researchers related to this field. Apart from voluminous secondary materials, my primary sources will be US Government publications, including those published by the Congress, India's Government publications, and interviews conducted specifically for this thesis. Interviews were conducted some of the policy makers and academics involving in the decision making process at different times. The interviews are very important to the study because it deals with recent events for which not all relevant government documents are yet released. Another source of primary material will be

⁵⁸The concept of security studies developed during the Cold War period. Stephen Walt defines security studies as 'the studies of the threat, use, and control of military force'. See Stephen Walt, *The Renaissance of Security Studies* (1991). It is the study how to protect a country from external and internal threats.

⁵⁹Foreign policy analysis is the study of management of a state's relations and activities with other countries in the world. It is concerned with theory development and empirical study of how a country formulates foreign policy and what would be the ultimate outcome of that policy. In a word, it analyses the decision making process of a country while maintaining its relations with other actors.

recently declassified official documents from the previous administrations. Other primary sources are public statements made by high officials in speeches, speeches of the leadership, press conferences, oral testimonies in congressional hearings and their interviews. Articles in the newspapers and editorials have also been used for this research. Another source of primary materials would be the various publications of think tanks and research institutions based in Washington.

It is important to note here that all of the sources, used in this investigation, either primary or secondary, have their limitations. Secondary sources, books or articles, can quickly become dated or even obsolete when discussing the contemporary issues. The memoirs and other accounts by policy makers can be shaped by a desire to defend their own actions rather than give a balanced account of events. There is no way to completely avoid the distortions these and other similar factors give rise to and the goal of a perfectly objective account of this relationship is a chimera. However every attempt has been made to minimize these limitations by drawing on competing accounts from different ideological positions, accepting no so single source as objective without subjecting it critical analysis. Finally, the thesis is intended to be reflexive inasmuch as the author's own potential biases in selection and interpretation of evidence are subject to critical scrutiny at every stage.

Conducting semi-structured interviews with relevant actors as a method of generating primary data that could inform both this checking process and reveal information not in the public domain played a critical role in the construction of this thesis. However, in practice there were significant limitations on the evidence generated by this method. The initial plan was to conduct interviews in Washington DC. The number of interviewees available in the time available for the research visit to Washington was also constrained by finance and by the fact that many interlocutors became unavailable at short notice. The outcome was that the interview schedule was confined to 10 interlocutors, as follows.

1. Ambassador Richard Boucher
2. Ambassador Howard B. Schaffer
3. Ambassador Anthony Quainton in American University
4. Dr. Satu Limaye, East West Centre
5. Dr. Thomas Lynch, American Defence University

6. Robert M. Hathaway, Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars
7. Professor Thomas Farr, Georgetown University
8. Professor Deepa Ollapally, George Washington University
9. Professor Stephen P. Cohen, Brookings Institution
10. Professor Mike Green, Georgetown University.

This group included two who were Indian-American and had strong connections with policy makers in New Delhi, which gave some indirect access to Indian perspectives. Others were former US administration officials with deep insight into, and firsthand knowledge of, the topics covered in this thesis. In sum the material gathered by this method proved helpful to the development of the argument of the thesis and made contributions to understanding on specific topics, but its scope was restricted by the constraints referred to.

1.5 Literature Review

This section analyses and evaluates the existing literature on the subject of the thesis, and indicates lacunae in it. Although the literature on US foreign policy is voluminous and that on US-India relations in general is large, that on US India policy in post 9/11 is less substantial.

The leading work on the immediate historical background to the period examined in this thesis, namely US policy toward India from the establishment of diplomatic relations until the end of the Cold War, is Dennis Kux's, *India and the United States: Estranged Democracies 1941-1991*. This is a comprehensive volume in which Kux describes the ups and downs⁶⁰ of Indo-US relations during the period and explains why these two democracies remained estranged⁶¹ despite having same kind of political system and values⁶². Having been a career diplomat gave Kux the opportunity to observe the policy making process from close proximity; this distinctive perspective was supplemented with documentary research on declassified documents⁶³ and interviews with US and Indian officials.

⁶⁰ Dennis Kux, *India and the United States: Estranged Democracies 1941-1991*, National Defense University Press, Washington, 1992, p. 414.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 330, 450, 447.

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 354, 453.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 454..

Kux recounts in detail the evolution of Indo-US relations, focussing on those factors that prevented more positive engagement⁶⁴. Primary among these was the policy of containment⁶⁵ of Soviet Communism pursued by the United States. Despite its avowed neutrality the abiding US fear was that India was too closely tied to the USSR and therefore had to be kept at a distance by the US. Supplementary to this Washington's favouring of Pakistan as part of the Great game with the USSR was an almost permanent irritant for Delhi. There were points of better relations, notably during the Kennedy administration at the time of the Indo-Chinese War when strategic factors favoured US cultivation of India but the overarching determinant of estrangement was the struggle with Soviet communism. Kux is relevant to this thesis because it provides context but as the main thrust of its argument on the relationship were factors that disappeared more or less precisely when this thesis begins, its relevance is confined to background status. It helps to demonstrate just how much had changed with the end of the Cold War and in that sense brings into relief the process of globalisation that, as is argued in this thesis, becomes the new primary driver of the relationship between Washington and New Delhi.

For the period most relevant to this study, Stephen P. Cohen has been perhaps the most eminent scholar on the US/India relationship. This thesis will argue that the emergence of India as a power with significant capacity to act in a leading role on the world stage has been one of the major factors driving the reassessments and evolution of US policy. Cohen's book, *'India: Emerging Power'*, published in 2001 details the bases on which this emergence had begun to take place in the decade after the Cold War. India's decision to drop misguided Cold War policies, both in terms of transforming antiquated domestic economic structures and adopting a more open attitude to the West, combined with the emergence of China as a serious rival to focus US attention on India and lay the groundwork for, if not an alliance then at least a closer more cordial forms of cooperation than had existed previously. Indeed as the US sought to adapt to the emergence of a range of new powers, India was seen by many as perhaps the most promising potential partner to assist in adapting to these changes. Its multicultural and multi ethnic identity suited it to a more diverse world and the rapidly growing diaspora

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 374, 381, 389, 391, 417, 441.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 55, 104, 112, 227.

in the US only served to draw to act as a bridge between the two biggest pluralist, multi-ethnic democracies in the world.⁶⁶

Cohen's contribution in demonstrating India's new found capacities is seminal to analyses of US-India relations, including this one. His later contributions focussed first on the importance of Pakistan to the relationship and how enduring its role has been as a complicating factor⁶⁷. Cohen recognised that the path to the improved US-India relationship he both analysed and sought was never likely to be smooth and, within the period of this thesis, his 2010 book, *Arming without Aiming*, he demonstrated some of the limitations of India's emergence in the security field. In pointing to these limitations and balancing them against his optimism about India's growing influence, he has served as a guide to the analysis of this thesis, which attempts to follow in this spirit of balance⁶⁸.

As a policy this subject area has attracted the attention of think tanks and much of literature is dominated by reports emanating from them, often from authors who, in the American fashion, have been government officials and move between the two spheres with ease. This can give the literature a very narrow focus on the sorts of problems that confront policy makers daily but which do not go beyond immediate concerns. Papers are often oriented towards advocacy of a particular line for policy but lack a framework for fundamental criticism or for placing it in wider analytic context. Perhaps the major think tank figure in this field, widely considered America's top India expert and someone who has in some writing been able to avoid these pitfalls, is Ashley Tellis. In his 2007 article, '*The Transforming US-Indian Relationship and Its Significance for American Interests*' Tellis traces the evolution of the relationship. He describes how the United States pressed the Britain to grant India its independence. In return, India, under the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru, initially showed India's eagerness to develop a friendship with the US, building on positive public attitudes towards the US, but eventually opted for leadership of the Non-Aligned Movement. As others have noted Tellis argues that 1962 was the peak of the post war relationship, although relations deteriorated thereafter warming only a little in the decade leading to the end of the Cold

⁶⁶ Stephen P. Cohen, *India: Emerging Power*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, DC, 2001.

⁶⁷ Stephen P. Cohen, *The US and South Asia*, Asia Foundation Study, San Francisco, 2006.

⁶⁸ Stephen P. Cohen and Dasgupta, Sunil, *Arming without Aiming: India's Military Modernization*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, D.C. 2010.

War before improving significantly in the post Soviet decade under Clinton and taking a major step forward under George W Bush, culminating in the civil nuclear agreement that received congressional approval in 2008⁶⁹. While Tellis recognised it was the collapse of the USSR that facilitated this improvement he also acknowledged that the agreement was the culmination of a shift in strategic thinking under Bush superior to that under Clinton, and for which his administration deserved credit especially in its understanding of the strategic role India could play as a counterweight to Chinese assertiveness.⁷⁰ This positive assessment of India's capacity underpinned the view of Obama's first administration, but after a promising start the relationship endured a bumpy passage as the Obama administration failed for a period to pursue it with the same vigour as Bush before resuming attention and reviving the upward arc that Tellis sees as the trajectory of the relationship. So, despite his close connections to the policy world Tellis is able to give a magisterial overview of the relationship. In the bulk of his writing however his perspective remains close to immediate policy concerns and brings conventional conceptual apparatus to them. He also acts a leading advocate for improving a relationship that he is analysing and while this does not undermine the acuity of much of his writing; it does compromise its intellectual independence in a way that this thesis seeks to avoid.

Closeness to government is not a bar to making an important contribution to the literature as well as serving as a source, however. The work of the Congressional Research Service, a government agency, demonstrates this. In a series of papers since early this century a team led by K Alan Kronstadt has used the access it has from working in government to produce a series of outstanding and authoritative briefing papers on US/India relations. These not only offer background and detail on specific issues but also carry out extensive survey of all issues facing the relationship. In the process they sometimes offer comprehensive literature reviews as an element of their papers, so providing an invaluable source for this thesis.

In a 2007 report '*India-U.S. Relations*' Kronstadt demonstrated South Asia's importance in US foreign policy calculus, where India as the biggest actor occupied a dominant place. He too described India as an emerging power that was a natural partner

⁶⁹ Ashley J., Tellis, 'The Transforming U.S.-Indian Relationship and Its Significance for American Interests', *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, Washington, D.C. 2007.

⁷⁰ Ashley J., Tellis, 'The Evolution of U.S.-Indian Ties: Missile Defense in an Emerging Strategic Relationship', *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 4, Spring, 2006.

of the US. He pointed to progress on a variety of issues such as civil nuclear cooperation, civil space cooperation, high-technology trade and security issues and argued that, although differences over such issues as the status of Kashmir hindered the development of a strategic partnership, India's economic liberalisation and its potential counterweight to China made US interest in cultivating it clear⁷¹. In other reports the CRS service under Kronstadt's leadership analysed economic relations⁷² and security issues⁷³, lauding the progress that had been made but also discussing barriers to deeper cooperation. This perspective thus joined and helped to create a consensus in the literature around the idea that while there were setbacks and difficulties, such as those around visas, the path of the relationship was, and from the US perspective should be, upward.

As the strategic importance of India as a strategic partner to the US has become accepted in the literature so the relationship has attracted increased interest from not only specialists but scholars of grand strategy. Harsh V. Pant is one of the most prominent Indian scholars who has written on both specific topics and broader strategic ones. Perhaps his most substantial contribution comes in his book, *'The US-India Nuclear Pact: Policy, Process, and Great Power Politics'* where he provided a forensic analysis of the process that started during the Clinton period and ended with the signing of historic deal in 2008. Pant provides a detailed account of the policy, processes, politics, and hindrances that faced both countries at home and abroad in a messy route to a final deal which ended India's 30 years of nuclear isolation⁷⁴. In another article, *'Indian Foreign Policy Responds to the U.S. Pivot'* Pant explained India's strategy in dealing with US rebalancing Asia policy. India saw the pivot as an opportunity to increase its leverage in the international arena gaining influence with both the US and China. The mutual goal of restraining the growth of Chinese influence helped India to become strategically closer to the US while at the same time maintaining a distance

⁷¹ K. Alan Kronstadt, 'India-U.S. Relations', *CRS Report for Congress*, October 2, 2007.

⁷² Michael F. Martin, Shayerah Ilias Akhtar, K. Alan Kronstadt, Samir Kumar, Alison Siskin, 'India-U.S. Economic Relations: In Brief', *Congressional Research Service*, September 26, 2014.

⁷³ K. Alan Kronstadt and Sonia Pinto, 'India-US Security Relations: Current Engagement', *CRS Report for Congress*, November 13, 2012.

⁷⁴ Harsh V. Pant, *The US-India Nuclear Pact: Policy, Process and Great Power Politics*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2011.

from total identification in line with the axiom that while the United States pivots, India hedges⁷⁵.

Sumit Ganguly is another Indian borne, though in his case US based scholar who has made a significant contribution to the literature, focusing on the Indian side of the relationship. In his article '*India's Foreign Policy Grows Up*' discussed how India's foreign policy evolved from a non-alignment to strategic partnership with the United States. For him the sign of growing maturity came as India moved beyond studied neutrality between superpowers in the Cold War to a more independent profile, moving for example towards making Israel a strategic partner overturning long association with Islamic countries that had reflected the interests of its own Muslim population. It also adopted a 'Look East' policy to capitalise on the large growing market in Southeast Asia⁷⁶. Following the policy-oriented advocacy that is characteristic of the literature, in addition to analysing India's failure in a later book, '*India as an Emerging Power*' Ganguly also provided a prescription on how it could become a player in international politics. Its strong stance against terrorism after 9/11 and offers of assistance to the US were a sign of India's growing capacity to raise its voice in the international arena⁷⁷.

S. Paul Kapur, added to the dominant perspective in a 2007 article, '*The Transformation of US-India Relations: An Explanation for the Rapprochement and Prospects for the Future*' in which he argued that the relationship had been on an upward path since the end of the Cold War where previously it had been marked by mutual distrust and suspicion. He traces this improvement seeing convergence not only in structural and domestic factors but also in the contribution played by individual leadership who proved capable of moving beyond the Cold War paradigm and taking the steps necessary to build trust and confidence.⁷⁸ Kapur, in other writing, also demonstrates how the greatest threat to stability in the region, its nuclearisation after tests by both Pakistan and India in 1998, was addressed by the Clinton administration.

⁷⁵ Harsh V. Pant and Yogesh Joshi, 'Indian Foreign Policy Responds to the U.S. Pivot', *Asia Policy*, Number 19, January 2015.

⁷⁶ Sumit Ganguly, 'India's Foreign Policy Grows Up', *World Policy Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 4, December 2003.

⁷⁷ Sumit Ganguly, *India as an Emerging Power*, Frank Cass Publishers, UK, 2003.

⁷⁸ S. Paul Kapur and Sumit Ganguly, 'The Transformation of US-India Relations: An Explanation for the Rapprochement and Prospects for the Future', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 47, Issue 4, July-August 2007.

Overt conflict was avoided but perhaps this was due more to a new nuclear-based balance of fear than to the efforts of the US, and anyway after 9/11 the US agenda moved from non-proliferation to the War on Terror and this became its primary driver of its policy towards the sub-continent⁷⁹.

C. Raja Mohan, a distinguished think tanker brought another dimension to the literature by addressing in his article, *Indo-U.S. relations: Who's afraid of America?* He discussed the question of America's status in the international order. He suggested that, despite having many problems, the United States, would remain the world's foremost military and economic power in the years to come but that it would have to adapt and could no longer lead in the same way as it had done over the previous 70 years. It is imperative for Indian leadership to understand this historic change as well as the continuing power of the US if it is to maximise the benefits of partnership⁸⁰. Most of his commentary stressed the warming of the relationship, dating from the nuclear deal which created unprecedented sympathy among Indians toward the United States. This was initially capitalised on by Obama but this was followed by increased scratchiness before the advent of Modi brought a new chapter⁸¹. Whether this optimism on the latest stage is justified is outside the period analysed by this thesis but the narrative of a gradual if uneven development of a strategic partnership reinforces the optimistic narrative that, as we have seen, is dominant in the literature.

Pursuant to the theme of America's changing role in the world there is a vast literature on the general characteristics and evolution of US foreign policy. This is not directly relevant to the specific focus of this thesis but some of the general arguments can be used to shed light on it. As examples Stephen Sestanovich, provides a comprehensive historical background in, *Maximalist: America in the World from Truman to Obama*⁸² while Fareed Zakaria effectively started the increasingly prominent trend of analysing

⁷⁹ S. Paul Kapur, 'India and Pakistan's Unstable Peace: Why Nuclear South Asia is not Like Cold War Europe?', *International Security*, Volume 30, Number 2, Fall 2005 also see S. Paul Kapur, 'Ten Years of Instability in a Nuclear South Asia', *International Security*, Volume 33, Number 2, Fall 2008.

⁸⁰ C. Raja Mohan, 'Indo-U.S. relations: Who's afraid of America', *India Today*, December 27, 2012.

⁸¹ C. Raja Mohan, 'India-US Relations: Modi and Obama Begin a New Chapter', *ISAS Brief*, No. 360, 29 January 2015, Institute of South Asian Studies, NUS, Singapore.

⁸² Stephen Sestanovich, *Maximalist: America in the World from Truman to Obama*, Vintage Books, New York, 2014.

American relative 'decline', a debate that reached its peak around the time of the beginning of the second Obama administration⁸³.

Several authors take the Bush Doctrine as a significant turning point in American foreign policy and attempt to determine the trajectory after its enunciation. These include, Ivo H. Daalder, and James M. Lindsay, '*America Unbound: The Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy*',⁸⁴ and Robert Jervis, '*American Foreign Policy in a New Era*'⁸⁵. The beginning of the post Bush era was a high point for literature and books attempting to understand how the Obama years might play out include, Timothy Lynch & Robert Singh '*After Bush: The Case for Continuity in American Foreign Policy*'⁸⁶, Melvyn P. Leffler and Jeffrey W. Legro titled '*To Lead the World: American Strategy after the Bush Doctrine*'⁸⁷, Zbigniew Brzezinski and Brent Scowcroft '*America and the World: Conversations on the Future of American Foreign*'⁸⁸, John Davis '*Barack Obama and US Foreign Policy: Roadmap for Change or Disaster?*'⁸⁹ and Tariq Ali '*The Obama Syndrome: Surrender at Home, War Abroad*'⁹⁰.

John Ikenberry is perhaps the leading analyst of US adaptation to the new world order in the relevant period and in several significant contributions was one of the first to emphasise the suitability of India as a partner in this new order⁹¹. John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt have also made significant contributions from a different and more critical perspective and their '*The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*', was important in

⁸³ Fareed Zakaria, *The Post-American World And the Rise of the Rest*, Penguin Books, 2009.

⁸⁴ Ivo H. Daalder and H. and James M Lindsay, *America Unbound: The Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, 2003.

⁸⁵ Robert Jervis, *American Foreign Policy in a New Era*, Routledge, 2005.

⁸⁶ Timothy J. Lynch and Robert S. Singh, *After Bush: The Case for Continuity in American Foreign Policy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.

⁸⁷ Melvyn P. Leffler, and Jeffrey W. Legro (ed.), *To Lead the World: American Strategy after the Bush Doctrine*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008.

⁸⁸ Zbigniew Brzezinski and Brent Scowcroft, *America and the World: Conversations on the Future of American Foreign Policy*, Basic Books, New York, 2008.

⁸⁹ John Davis, *Barack Obama and US Foreign Policy: Roadmap for Change or Disaster?*, Author House, Indiana, 2009.

⁹⁰ Tariq Ali, *The Obama Syndrome: Surrender at Home, War Abroad*, Verso, London, 2010.

⁹¹ G. John Ikenberry 'The Future of the Liberal World Order: Internationalism After America', *Foreign Affairs*, May/June Issue, 2011, also see G. John Ikenberry, 'American hegemony and East Asian order', *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 58, No. 3, September 2004, G. John Ikenberry (ed.), *America Unrivaled: The Future of the Balance of Power*, Cornell University Press, 2002, G. John Ikenberry (Ed), *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays*, Longman, 2002.

understanding how US foreign policy was being formulated and influenced⁹². And, finally, the doyen of US foreign policy analysts and himself formerly a practitioner, Joseph Nye takes a firm stand on the debate surrounding US standing, arguing that we are not living in a post-American world, that America can and will maintain its hegemonic stance but that the world is becoming more complex and the US will need cooperation from partners⁹³. The implications for the US India relationship are clear.

Before closing this review mention should be made of some non-US and non-Indian authors who have made relevant contributions to the analysis of US foreign policy. UK scholar John Dumbrell, in a book edited with Axel R. Schäfer, described how the United States maintained its relationships with its friends to help achieve its policy objectives⁹⁴, and in other works he has surveyed the foreign policies of all the administrations since Carter⁹⁵. Stephen Burman in, *'The State of the American Empire: How the USA shapes the World'* detailed the US footprint across the globe⁹⁶.

This review can give only a brief indication of the extent of the literature surrounding this topic, both in analyses of US foreign policy and more specific studies on aspects of the US-India relationship general terms. The works highlighted here have influenced the argument proposed in this thesis but none mirror the specific study of the period from 9/11 until the end of the first Obama administration or attempt to address the specific research questions involved. It is to these we now turn.

1.6 Research Questions

It is the premise of this study that US foreign policy toward India underwent a significant change after the end of the Cold War and that 9/11 caused this process to accelerate. The rise of China and India as major powers also exerted a major influence on policy as part of a shift in the global balance of power associated with globalisation. With this background, the study addresses a set of primary and secondary research questions. The primary questions are:

⁹² John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York, 2008.

⁹³ Joseph S. Nye, *Is the American Century Over?*, Polity Press, UK, 2015.

⁹⁴ John Dumbrell and Axel R. Schäfer (eds.), *America's Special Relationships: Allies and Clients*, Routledge, London, 2009.

⁹⁵ John Dumbrell, *American Foreign Policy: Carter to Clinton*, McMillan Press, 1997.

⁹⁶ Stephen Burman, *The State of the American Empire: How the USA Shapes the World*, Earthscan, London, 2007.

- What aspects of US national interest, as reconfigured after 9/11, led the US to develop its policy toward India?
- What forces in the international arena after 9/11 drove the US to develop its policy toward India?
- Did the growing relationship between India and the US contribute to the stability of the international order and America's hegemonic role within it?
- To what extent did US and Indian interests converge in this period?

The secondary questions are:

- What was the impact of 9/11 on US attitudes to the sub-continent?
- To what extent did the approaches to India of the Bush and Obama administrations' differ, both conceptually and practically?

1.7 Structure of the Thesis

My investigation will follow US relations with India since its independence in 1947 until the end of Obama's first term, but the main focus will be on events since 9/11. This study will draw a picture of the trajectory of Indo-US relations in following seven chapters.

Chapter 1: the introductory chapter provides an overview of the thesis and develops its main argument. The primary purpose of this chapter is to lay out the overall argument of the thesis and give an indication of how the body of the thesis will deal with subject matter.

Chapter II will illustrate the historical background of US foreign policy towards India since India's independence in 1947, when two countries began their official relations, until the beginning of the 21st century. It will show the great change in India's traditional foreign policy in 1990s, with the significant reforms to its economy leading the Clinton Administration to make a shift toward India.

Chapter III delves into the conceptual thinking of the Bush administration's policy in general, but specifically toward India after 9/11. It will outline the policy before 9/11 as a basis for comparison with the post-9/11 period. It will analyse the impact of 9/11 on the Bush Administration's thinking about the South Asian region. The investigation will focus on the extent of change in the administration's foreign policy from its pre-9/11

state both in relation to the War on Terror and with regard to the implications for the subcontinent.

Chapter IV will sketch the implementation of policy by the Bush administration toward India. It will elucidate how after many years of being ‘estranged democracies’, the US and India have crossed the threshold and entered into a new era that can best be described as ‘engaged democracies’. It will demonstrate the clear agreement over the global issue of terrorism that developed between the United States and India. In 2006, Washington and New Delhi signed a landmark civilian nuclear cooperation pact during President Bush’s visit to New Delhi. The policies of the NSSP initiative of the Bush administration included different major issues in the Indo-US relationship and the Open Skies Agreement. This chapter will delineate the various stages of discussions, talks, agreements, cooperation and processes of the Bush administration that culminated in the nuclear agreement in 2008, an agreement that modified the US policy of nuclear non-proliferation, acknowledged India as a nuclear state and ended India’s quest of over three decades for such recognition.

Chapter V is about the conceptual thinking of the first Obama administration in relation to its policy toward India. The Bush administration left Obama with international relationships in disarray and this chapter will compare the differences in thinking between the Bush and Obama administrations. President Obama came to office promising ‘change’ that denoted an overall transformation in the manner in which the US conducted its security and foreign policies. The chapter will consider how the Obama Administration shifted the policy of unilateralism⁹⁷ pursued by the Bush Administration toward a policy of multilateralism. The study will also analyse whether the Obama administration’s efforts to restore the US presence in Asia marked a key point of departure from the policies of his predecessor.

Chapter VI will assess the implementation of policy under the first Obama administration. It will show how the Obama administration looked for more active engagement with the countries of Asia, making efforts to improve Washington’s

⁹⁷Unilateralism is used here as a shorthand to describe the policy of the Bush administration, especially in its early years, to capitalise on its dominant position in international affairs. This was driven by the idea that the US was sufficiently powerful to pursue its national interest without the need to cultivate partners, and that if other nations were unwilling to act as partners the US would act alone rather than allow pursuit of its goals to be frustrated by the inability to take collective action.

relations with friends, partners, and allies, and how it cooperated with Beijing on issues at a bilateral, regional and global level from the beginning of its term of office. As Obama was determined to combat terrorism but did not accept Bush's concept of a 'global war on terror', this study will look into how he sought to wind down the ongoing wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, while neutralising Al Qaeda or any other terrorist organisation as a threat to the people of the United States. An attempt will also be made to search for how the Obama administration sought to carry on expanded engagement and cooperation with India while continuing the long-standing US policy of avoiding a direct role in bilateral disputes like the Kashmir issue. During his election campaign and immediately after his victory, Obama said that he would transform the image of the US and its role in the world. This chapter will look critically at whether and how far Obama was successful in this regard in his first term.

Chapter VII is the concluding chapter, which will match the conceptual framework and main thesis in Chapter I with the investigation of the subsequent empirical and conceptual chapters.

CHAPTER – TWO

Historical Background of US Foreign Policy – pre-9/11

2.1 Introduction: The Cold War Era

After the Second World War, the United States of America emerged as the mightiest power on the world stage, and chose to capitalise on this position by taking up a leading role in world affairs. As D S Painter points out, ‘Before World War II there were six great powers: Great Britain, France, Germany, the Soviet Union, Japan and the United States. By the end of the war, the United States stood alone, easily the most powerful nation in the world, its power greatly increased by its mobilization and war effort, its rival defeated, and its allies exhausted’.¹ The war ‘destroyed the old balance of power, leaving Germany and Japan crushed and impotent and reducing Great Britain and France to second or even third-rate powers’.² The United States owned the most powerful military in the world. Its air force directed the skies, its navy dominated the seas, its military occupied Japan and a part of Germany, and it possessed worldwide control over nuclear weapons. Its strength was enhanced by its advantageous geographic position.

In the period after the war, the world came to be divided into two camps: one led by the USA representing the capitalist countries, and the other by the USSR, representing the socialist countries of the world. This situation continued until the 1990s in a period usually described as the Cold War. The Cold War was characterised by an absence of actual global war but involvement in a number of proxy wars in different regions fought between the client states of the two divided camps. The United States also intervened in the internal affairs of other states through various kinds of covert and clandestine operations, as did the USSR. The United States led a number of secret operations to topple the governments of other regions, which included not only authoritarian regimes but democratically elected governments. There have been around 180 examples of the

¹ D. S. Painter, *Encyclopaedia of US Foreign Policy*, p. 27

² George C. Herring, *Encyclopaedia of American Foreign Policy*, p.112.

use of US forces worldwide in situations of military conflict or potential conflict in the past century.³

Not all countries wished to belong to either of these camps and this led to the formation of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). Many newly independent states, including India, did not choose to align with either block, and created a third platform where countries could maintain equidistance between them. The NAM was popular because almost all third world⁴ countries wanted to develop their economies and infrastructure but also to maintain their independence. Keeping distance from the Western and Soviet camps but seeking aid from both was the best way to reconcile these objectives. The Cold war ended when the Soviet Union dissolved and disintegrated in 1991 and the US gave its diplomatic recognition to the Russian Federation and other newly independent states separated from the Soviet Union. With these changes, 45 years of established diplomacy and military confrontation between two conflicting blocks ended, and new challenges confronted US policymakers.

2.2 India's Struggle for Independence (1945-47) and The US Relationship to Colonialism

India's struggle for independence was certainly one of the biggest mass movements in modern history. Subash Bose – less familiar to Westerners – used one of the most popular statements, 'Give me blood and I shall give you freedom' – where he appealed to the people of India to join in the struggle for independence.⁵ People responded to the call and it turned into a huge concentrated struggle which galvanized millions of people from different classes, sections and ideologies into political action and finally brought about the downfall of a mighty colonial master.⁶ The departure of the British from the subcontinent in 1947 created a predominantly Hindu India and overwhelmingly Muslim Pakistan. Ironically, the partition of the subcontinent was followed by one of the deadliest and cruellest examples of migration and ethnic cleansing in history, and was accompanied by huge bloodshed. The religious rage, fighting and violence that was

³Stephen Burman, *The State of the American Empire: How the USA Shapes the World*, Earthscan, London, 2007, p. 10.

⁴ The term 'third world' is being no longer in use but it came into usage in this period in order to describe precisely the idea that there was a third camp that did not want to follow either the US or the USSR.

⁵http://www.archive.india.gov.in/nowindia/culture_heritage.php?id=7 accessed on 2 August 2015.

⁶Bipan Chandra, Mridula Mukherjee, Aditya Mukherjee et. al, *India's Struggle for Independence 1857-1947*, Penguin Books India Pvt Ltd, 1989, p. 1.

responsible for the loss of some two millions lives including Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs, and at least 75,000 women raped.⁷

India's independence struggle was the creation of the obvious contradiction between British colonialism and the interests of the natives. The British propagated the idea that they were there to educate the people and giving them a better way of life: what they called 'white man's burden'. However, the leadership of the nationalist movement gradually reached a clear understanding of colonialism, and understood that the British were exercising their political control to subjugate the economy and society of the subcontinent to fulfil the needs of their own society and economy. Subsequently, this generated a clear-cut anti-colonial ideology.⁸

Since the beginning of their anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movement, the people of India expressed their solidarity with the other parts of the world fighting for the same cause. The Indian leadership was firmly against the British policy of interference of internal matters of other states. They also opposed the use of Indian forces and resources of any kind to promote British imperialism in any part of the world.⁹ These attitudes, formed in the colonial period, helped shape subsequent relations with the US, which developed in the post-colonial era.

Before the Second World War, the US contact with India was in name only. As Harold Isaacs in his book *Scratches on Our Minds: American Views of China and India* stated, US 'interaction with India occurs less dramatically, along a narrower arc, in a smaller compass of awareness and interest'¹⁰ because America has much less shared history with India than with Japan or China. Isaacs's study showed a general preference of China and the Chinese to India and Indians by the Americans. Interestingly Isaacs's findings were based on interviews conducted during the peak of the Cold War and after the Korean War when America fought for three years against China.¹¹ The end of the Second World War, however, saw a remarkable change in their relations.

⁷Ishtiaq Ahmed, 'The 1947 Partition of India: A Paradigm for Pathological Politics in India and Pakistan', *Asian Ethnicity*, Vol. 3, No. 1, March 2002, P. 9.

⁸Bipan Chandra, et. al, *India's Struggle for Independence 1857-1947*, p. 527.

⁹*Ibid.* p.388.

¹⁰Harold R. Isaacs, *Scratches on Our Minds: American Views of China and India*, Routledge, 2015, p. xxxiii

¹¹ Arthur G. Rubinoff, 'Changing Perceptions of India in the US Congress', *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, Vol. 28, No.1, 2001, p. 40.

Britain needed India's manpower and resources to fight the war. The Indian Congress denied extending its support for fighting against the Axis powers as long as Britain would not promise Indian independence.¹² The demand of the National Congress was overlooked and, in September 1939, Lord Linlithgow – the British Viceroy – declared India's participation in the war without consulting important leaders in India. The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour in December 1941 brought the US into the war. The strategic significance of India as a base for operations against Japan, led Roosevelt to take an interest in the Indian political problem. He thought that the political disorder in India could jeopardize the US forces which were to be sent to India. Roosevelt wanted a solution to the problem but was hesitant to engage himself directly in efforts to obtain it. The United Kingdom did not want the two nations to engage in direct contact, fearing that India might get motivation and encouragement from America in escalating its political struggle for freedom. Finally, Roosevelt wrote a letter to Churchill on 10 March 1942, proposing a bold initiative: the formation of an Indian Government comprised of the various religious, geographical, and occupational groups. Thus, the Second World War marks the beginning of official Indo-US relations.¹³

World War II increased US interest in India. America, waging a war to establish democracy against the forces of totalitarianism, combined with Roosevelt's increasing 'animosity toward British imperialism',¹⁴ could hardly keep its eyes closed to the subjugation of 400 million Indians by Britain– its closest ally. President Roosevelt was under severe pressure at home from the Republicans and his vice-president to take a strong stand against British imperialism. The people of the United States were also concerned for India's independence. American sympathy for India's freedom struggle was natural in light of its own history of colonisation by the British. Roosevelt was particularly keen to help India, but also reluctant to pressure Churchill during the war or to strongly intervene on behalf of Indian nationalists. But he never stopped discussing the Indian issue in his regular and voluminous communication with Churchill. It became evident that the US was willing to support the British policy of granting independence

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 42.

¹³Dheeraj Kumar, 'Indo-US Relations: Historical Perspectives', *Strategic Insights*, Vol. VIII, Issue 3 August 2009, Centre for Contemporary Conflict, p.3.

¹⁴ See for detail Eric S. Rubin, 'America, Britain, and *Swaraj*: Anglo-American Relations and Indian Independence, 1939–1945', *India Review*, Vol. 10, No. 1, January–March, 2011, p. 49.

for India after the war, and that its main interest was more in the Middle East and the politics of oil than in the fate of India.¹⁵

2.3 Containment of the Soviet Union: US attitudes to India and Pakistan in the 1950s

The major development in US foreign policy after the WWII was the new, distinctive policy of 'containment', designed to combat the spread of communism in the world. This policy was developed by US diplomat George Kennan and was first coined in an article published in 1947.¹⁶ He branded the USSR an anti-Western and aggressive power whose expansion had to be contained, a portrayal which would shape American foreign policy for years to come.¹⁷ The containment policy dominated geopolitics and created a bipolar, zero-sum world. The antipathy between the two powers led to a worldwide competition as both nations vied for military, cultural, and economic supremacy. In this context, containing Soviet communism became the main focus of US foreign policy for over four decades of the Cold War.¹⁸

During the entire Cold War period, the primary objective of American foreign policy was to limit the Soviet sphere of influence. Stephen Burman wrote in the 1990s that 'The initial American policy after the war was one of containment, interpreted as the adoption of the role of world policemen, willing to intervene in any conflict in order to prevent communism expanding its influence'.¹⁹ This governed the policy of the US and its allies in the Korean peninsula, in overthrowing the Iranian government, the Vietnam War, the Yom Kippur War, the Six Day War, and finally the policy of helping the Mujahideen in Afghanistan to fight the Soviet military. The US had some successes and some failures during this period. In the late 1980s, a programme of high military expenditure by the Reagan Administration was followed by diplomatic overtures between President Reagan and Gorbachev. A thaw resulted, and it is arguable that it was this combination that contributed to the breakdown of the Soviet Union.

¹⁵ Dinesh Singh, 'Indo-US Relations', *Strategic Analysis*, Vol. 33, No. 6 November 2009, p. 931.

¹⁶ X. 'The Sources of Soviet Conduct', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 25 No.4, July 1947, pp. 575, 581.

¹⁷ There is a major debate as to whether Kennan's article actually justified the policy of containment as it was later practised. Kennan himself disowned authorship of US policy although it is still arguable that he provided the essential ideas that others took forward. See *Kennan and Containment, 1947* for details available at <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/kennan>

¹⁸ Trevor B. McCrisken, *American Exceptionalism and the Legacy of Vietnam: US Foreign Policy since 1974*, Palgrave MacMillan, 2003, p. 21.

¹⁹ Stephen Burman, *America in the Modern World: The Transcendence of United States Hegemony*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hertfordshire, 1991, p.117.

Right from India's independence in 1947 until the end of the Cold War, India was viewed through a Cold War perspective by the US.²⁰ After the Second World War when the rise and spread of communism became more alarming and countries of Asia, Africa and Europe were politically volatile, militarily and an economically weak Britain was no longer able to hold world leadership, US policy-makers felt they should lead the world in opposing communism. Given the circumstances, the United States gave up its so-called traditional policy of 'isolationism', committed to 'internationalism', undertook world leadership and adopted a global strategy of anti-communism.²¹ This stance had popular support; 71 percent of US citizens responded to a Gallup poll conducted in October 1945 by agreeing that it was 'best for the future of this country if we take an active role in world affairs'.²²

The United States felt that the threat of spreading communism could be countered by the unified actions of America and the non-communist countries of Asia like India and Pakistan. India, however, refused to be part of a US-led military alliance. The US viewed India's potential role and capabilities as unsuited to Western requirements and maintained strategic distance. India after independence wanted better relationships with both the superpowers and sought to do this, initially at least, by maintaining equidistance from them. The United States wanted to assist the countries in the region to develop a relatively open society and also develop economically, but India was not ready to open up its economy and society in ways that would have been required if it was to be a close ally of the US. Given this, United States policy-makers did not believe that India was in a position to provide leadership in the region in the struggle against communism. Pakistan responded to the US search for allies with keen interest as it was looking for friends to counter its arch enemy, India. It found a sympathetic response in Washington. The US containment policy required that countries adjacent to the Sino-Soviet bloc be allied with the West in order to combat expansion of the bloc and Pakistan appeared well placed to contribute to this. Pakistan, as a Muslim country, with close relations with Middle East, geographical closeness to the major communist rivals and to the oil-rich Persian Gulf, plus its own potential and keenness to be an actor

²⁰ Chuck Ballingall, *US Foreign Policy towards India*, Proposed Topic for the 2011-12 High School Policy Debate Topic for the National Federation of States High School Association, Damien High School, California, p.2.

²¹ A. Z. Hilali, 'Cold War Politics of Superpowers in South Asia' *The Dialogue*, Pakistan Vol.1, No. 2, pp. 71-72.

²² Trevor B. McCrisken, *American Exceptionalism and the Legacy of Vietnam: US Foreign Policy since 1974*, p. 21.

as regional balancer to India, made it a more attractive ally to the US than India.²³ Islamabad was ready to side with the US policy of containing communism in Asia and to take in US military alliances, in the process gaining US support in its conflict with New Delhi.²⁴

In May 1954, the United States entered into a mutual defence pact with Pakistan, and Islamabad became a member both of the South East Asian Treaty Organisation (SEATO) and the Central Treaty Organisation (CENTO). Islamabad was not driven primarily by a policy of containment or an anti-Communist agenda. Rather it joined the military alliances to obtain US military assistance and acquire weapons that could be used against its principal enemy – which was India, and not the USSR or China.²⁵

For Nehru, the Cold War had been imported to South Asia. US interest in South Asia was a by-product of Cold War rivalry. From this point on, at least until the end of the Cold War, Indian governments always remained concerned and suspicious of American national security policy in the region. This led them to drift away from a policy of equidistance and draw closer to the USSR, developing a form of alignment with the Soviet Union that was an evolution of its initial position of non-alignment. The USSR reciprocated by boosting India as a leader of the third world and in the NAM. It used India's leadership to improve its own image in the international sphere and to project a view of international affairs as close as possible to its own; a strategy intended ultimately to assist in its competition with the United States and China.²⁶

2.4 Indian Foreign Policy

Jawahar Lal Nehru – first Prime Minister of India – left a deep mark on India's foreign policy. The basic principles of India's foreign policy, articulated by him, persisted as the guiding principles for succeeding governments. This does not mean that Indian policy had an element of inflexibility or rigidity; rather the principles have been adapted to five key turning points,

1. US military pacts with Pakistan in 1954-55 forced Nehru to tilt towards the Soviet Union.

²³ A. Z. Hilali, *op.cit*, pp.72-73.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

²⁵ James Chiriyankandath, 'Realigning India: India Foreign Policy after the Cold War', *The Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 93, No. 374, April 2004, p. 200.

²⁶ A. Z. Hilali, *op cit*, p. 92.

2. The Indo-China conflict in 1962 and the neutral attitude of the Soviet Union dictated improved security links with the United States. This year was critical in the development of India's foreign policy as it became more pragmatic and realistic.
3. The Liberation War of Bangladesh in 1971 and the hostility of Nixon and Kissinger led India to conclude a treaty with Moscow.
4. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of Soviet communism, and the subsequent shifts in global power, changed the previous order of international affairs and led to a fundamental re-evaluation of Indian foreign policy.
5. September 11, 2001 made India a US ally in response to the global war on terrorism.

2.4.1 The Nehruvian Approach

Unquestionably, the fabric of Indian foreign policy after independence was the handiwork of Nehru. As the first Prime minister of India, he was at the wheel for 17 years (1947-1964) and enjoyed virtually monopolistic jurisdiction over foreign affairs. This gave him an unchallenged position to translate his ideas, accumulated during the freedom movement, into foreign policy. Indeed, 'he was the philosopher, the architect, the engineer and the voice of country towards the outside world'.²⁷ His vision was a happy amalgam of western liberalism, Marxism and Gandhism.²⁸

Although Indian foreign policy from independence always had some sort of realist element, it immediately adopted the idealistic stance that its foreign policy should uphold moral principles. It was against colonialism, racism, against any alignment, against balance of power politics, refusing to favour the containment of communism, but rather propagating peaceful coexistence. Nehru's 17 years of grand strategy envisioned a vital role for India which was not realist but the US security alliance with Pakistan and other regional powers in the 50s led India gradually to shift toward the policy of realism.²⁹

²⁷ Michael Brecher, *Nehru: A Political Biography*, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 315.

²⁸ B.R Nanda (ed.), *Introduction to Indian Foreign Policy: The Nehru Years*, Vikash Publication, New Delhi, 1976, p. 23.

²⁹ Dinshaw Mistry, 'A Theoretical and Empirical Assessment of India as an Emerging World Power', *India Review*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2004, p. 74.

Nehru's ability to lead the newly independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America led him to take the bold decision of refusing any alliance with either the West or East. Consequently, this contributed to him becoming a pioneer of the NAM. This policy and role was simultaneously the reflection of India's idealism and some element of realism. India's policy and efforts toward eradicating colonialism and racism manifested its idealist principle, while inhibiting war between the superpowers contained an element of realism.³⁰ In 1949, Nehru himself articulated his policy in the following way while speaking to the Indian Council of World:

India is too big a country herself to be bound down to any country, however big it may be. India is going to be and is bound to be a country that counts in world affairs... While remaining quite apart from power blocs, we are in a better position to cast our weight at the right moment in favour of peace, and meanwhile our relations can become as close as possible in the economic or other domain with such countries with whom we can easily develop them.³¹

He thought the 'containment' doctrine was unsound and plainly said so to President Truman in 1949. Nehru, however, wanted to contain the spread of communism in Asia and took steps accordingly. For instance, he helped Prime Minister U-Nu to crush the communist insurgency in Burma (Myanmar), supported the British attempt in doing the same in Malaysia, hailed the Brussels Pact (1948), and condoned the creation of NATO (1949). He also saw fundamental differences between Mao's China and Stalin's Russia. He was helped in this by Marshall Tito and M.N. Roy. The latter told Nehru that: 'Mao would prove a second Tito.' Roy had also characterised Chinese communism as nothing but 'nationalism painted red'. Nehru himself never regarded Mao as Stalin's stooge. Nehru realised that, only by winning China's confidence and support could India's role as a bridge builder be sustained and his goal of preventing Asia from becoming a theatre of the Cold War be achieved.

This perspective was the basis of a united front of Afro-Asian countries (reflected in the Bandung Conference of 1955) and for the declaration of the Panchsheel Treaty.³² While at various times in the 1950's and 1960's, the United States government attempted to improve relations with India, India became the leader of the NAM, purposely avoiding a

³⁰ James Chiriyankandath, p. 200.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² Panchsheel meant Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. The five principles were mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty; mutual non-aggression; mutual non-interference in one another's internal affairs; equality and cooperation for mutual benefit; and peaceful coexistence

close alliance either with the US or the USSR. To this end, India pursued the policy of Panchsheel towards the People's Republic of China.³³

But the Bandung spirit did not last. Nehru came to believe that that Mao's China did not stand for world peace and co-existence but instead for East-West conflict. He became wary of China and, recognising that Khrushchev was overturning Stalin's legacy and adopting a stance of peaceful co-existence, Nehru chose his company. He even helped Khrushchev in building bridges of understanding with America. Gradually a broad affinity developed between India and the Soviet Union, not only on such problems as Kashmir and Goa but also on wider world issues. This explains why Nehru showed deference to the susceptibilities of the Soviet Union and was critical of the role of the West in world affairs.³⁴

2.4.2 The Policy of Non-alignment

Nehru adopted the policy of non-alignment as the main principle of India's foreign policy for two major reasons. First, he was seriously concerned about the defence cost in case of any involvement either of the two blocs. Any conflict would involve huge resources, and might stop India's development as a newly independent country. Second, he was determined to maintain India's independence gained after a long struggle. He feared that aligning with either power bloc could hamper its freedom of manoeuvre. After his death, subsequent Indian leaders did not officially discard his stance of non-alignment. However, India did move toward a more realist approach.³⁵

Non-alignment meant maintaining neutrality in world affairs and equidistance from both the superpowers. Its main objective was peace and security, but pursuing this through an independent voice rather than following the line of either of the Cold War protagonists whose entrenched stances were not felt to be the path to peace and security. Non-alignment thus became a forum of unity for the countries of the developing world who saw the policies of the US and the USSR as quasi-imperialistic in relation to their needs. It provided them a base for mutual understanding and cooperation in political,

³³Sumit Ganguly and Manjeet S. Pardesi, 'Explaining Sixty Years of India's Foreign Policy', *India Review*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 2009, p. 7.

³⁴Prakash Chandra, , *International Relations*, Vikash Publishing House, New Delhi, 1994, pp. 168-9.

³⁵Sumit Ganguly and Manjeet S. Pardesi, pp. 6, 8.

economic and technological arena.³⁶ In this sense, the non-aligned movement became an alignment in its own right.

Non alignment was never strictly applied by India during the entire period of the Cold War. India played the superpowers off against each other switching its preference according to circumstances. Perhaps the most striking example was the reorientation of Indian foreign policy prompted by the Indo-China war in 1962. Reversing a previous drift towards the USSR, Nehru turned desperately to Washington for help. In the conflict, Washington accepted New Delhi's stance in respect of its border with Beijing and openly supported its interpretation. The conflict and US support led India to take a more pragmatic and realistic approach to international conflict than non-alignment.³⁷

Indian policy was tested again by the Liberation War of Bangladesh in 1971. This led India to conclude a treaty in August 1971 with the Soviet Union. The treaty was historic, the first of its kind that India had signed. This Treaty of friendship and cooperation provided for immediate consultations between them if either was attacked. This obviously indicated Soviet assurance to support India on the Bangladesh issue. Eventually, the creation of Bangladesh in 1971 made India a dominant power in South Asia.³⁸ Although Mrs Gandhi tried to keep the spirit of non-alignment intact, she tore up its substance by accepting Soviet support in the Bangladesh War.

As a backdrop to these crises and reversals, across the period of 1964 to 1990, India demonstrated its increasingly realist approach and unwillingness to be marginalised in world affairs, by building up its economic and military capabilities. It did not sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1968, thereby declining to give up the nuclear option. India's policy in supporting Bangladesh for achieving its independence proved successful and made its enemy weak in 1971 and finally became the world's sixth nuclear power after its nuclear test in 1974.³⁹

2.4.3 Policy after the Cold War

The turning point of Soviet disintegration was the most crucial moment in post war Indian foreign policy. The circumstances that influenced the principles of Indian foreign

³⁶Stanley A. Kochanek, Robert L. Hardgrave, *India: Government and Politics in a Developing Nation*, Thomson Wadsworth, Boston, 2008, p. 475.

³⁷ Neville Maxwell, *India's China War*, Natraj Publisher, Dehra Dun, 1970, p.146

³⁸Sumit Ganguly and Manjeet S. Pardesi, p. 9.

³⁹Dinshaw Mistry, p. 74.

policy in the late 40s and early 50s were the Cold War, bipolarization, the formation of military alliances, ideological struggle, the arms race, and the evils of imperialism, colonialism and racialism. After the Soviet collapse, most of these drivers disappeared and the military world became unipolar with the USA as the dominant military power; economically it became multi-polar with Germany, Japan, BRICS and USA as economic powers. Even though the national interest remained the foremost consideration, as was the case with the foreign policy of all governments, these dramatic developments required a re-assessment of India's foreign policy.

Policymakers in India responded to the changes in international order with prudence. Despite facing many developmental challenges, practicality in their thinking and judiciousness in adapting policy in political, strategic and economic fields enabled India to rise as a potential power.⁴⁰ In the first ten years of the post-Cold-War era, India followed an adaptive approach to regional and international affairs: it started liberalising its economy programme, it accepted arms from Moscow, and cautiously began engaging Beijing. By the early 2000s, these policies resulted in a position closer to the status of a major power that its capacities and aspirations warranted.⁴¹

2.5 Historical Background of Indo-US Relations

Having discussed the evolution of Indian foreign policy in the period up to 9/11 and the principles underlying it, I will now turn to a closer examination of the development of the relationship between the US and India from independence to 9/11.

2.5.1 The first Kashmir War, the Truman Administration, and India

The first Indo-US bilateral dispute arose over the Kashmir conflict,⁴² originating in the colonial history of the Indian subcontinent and its partition, when Britain granted independence for India and Pakistan in 1947.⁴³ When, after a few weeks of independence, India and Pakistan engaged in a war over Kashmir in January 1948 (known as the First Indo-Pak War), India referred the issue to the UN with anticipation that involvement of the international community might lead to a solution in its favour.

⁴⁰Sumit Ganguly and Manjeet S. Pardesi, p. 16.

⁴¹Dinshaw Mistry, pp. 74-75.

⁴² Dennis Kux, *India and the United States: Estranged Democracies 1941-1991*, National Defense University Press, Washington, 1992, p. 57.

⁴³Tahir Amin, 'Kargil Crisis in Kashmir', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 2000, p. 321.

India asserted that the invasion by Pakistan military was illegal and demanded an immediate withdrawal, while Pakistan charged that India had illegally achieved Kashmir's accession. The United Nations passed a resolution asking outside forces to withdraw. Though Pakistan initially refused to withdraw, the UN finally managed to obtain a ceasefire which became effective from January 1949.⁴⁴

At the beginning, the United States was unwilling to be involved in the Kashmir dispute and US policy makers paid relatively little attention. The United States supported the view of the United Kingdom that no independent Kashmir would be appropriate, but they agreed to a free and fair plebiscite to decide its fate.⁴⁵ President Truman and the British Prime Minister Clement Attlee put pressure on Nehru to accept the plebiscite to break the deadlock but Nehru refused to accept their suggestion and said he would 'not give an inch on the matter of Kashmir'.⁴⁶

The UNSC passed a resolution on 21 April 1948 setting up the UN Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP). The Indian response to the Commission was harsh, as the UN failed to condemn the Pakistani aggressor, and Nehru expressed his reaction forcefully as he saw the UN treating an aggressor and a defender equally. He blamed both the US and the UK for playing a 'dirty role' in the dispute. He regarded the US role on the Kashmir conflict with suspicion. He believed it to be responsible in making Sheikh Abdullah⁴⁷ think of an independent Kashmir, and felt they did not take the ground reality into consideration, looking at the problem only through the lenses of their global interests.⁴⁸

Nehru's suspicion and distrust of the Truman Administration's intention and his rigid stance on the plebiscite made the dispute a stalemate, and left it to the next (Eisenhower) administration to resolve. Besides Kashmir, the US and India had different stances on a number of other foreign policy issues not related to the Cold War: these included the creation of Israel, the Palestine problem, international control of atomic energy, and Indo-China relations. Nehru's insistence on being independent from

⁴⁴ Devin Hagerty, 'US Policy and the Kashmir Dispute: Prospects for Resolution', *India Review*, Vol. No. 3, 2003, p. 94.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 94-5.

⁴⁶ Rathnam, Indurthy, 'The Turns and Shifts in the U.S. Role in the Kashmir Conflict since 1947: Today's Propitious Times for a Facilitator to Resolve It', *Asian Affairs*, Vol. 32, No. 1, Spring, 2005, pp. 31-33.

⁴⁷ Sheikh Abdullah was the then Prime Minister of the state of Jammu and Kashmir. Later the term 'Prime Minister' was replaced as 'Governor' and then 'Chief Minister'.

⁴⁸ Prithvi Ram Mudiam, 'The India-Pakistan Dispute over Jammu and Kashmir and the United States', *Global Change, Peace & Security*, Vol. 15, No. 3, October 2003, p. 265.

the West irked policy makers in the US, though the US accepted India's decision to retain its non-aligned status.⁴⁹

Aid has always been an important issue in the relations between a developed and an under-developed or developing country. It was not a major issue immediately after the independence of India but in the 1950s and 1960s, economic assistance became important element of US policy toward India. The Truman Administration remained ambivalent about India and US Congressmen complained that India showed neither sympathy nor understanding toward US international problems and urged that its aid bill be rejected. At the end of 1949, severe food shortages⁵⁰ in India caused a famine and New Delhi asked the US for help to meet the food shortage. America responded positively though some misunderstandings created frustration. To remove the misunderstandings, when, in December 1950, the Indian Ambassador officially requested two million tons of wheat aid from Secretary Acheson, Ambassador Henderson supported the Indian request, saying the food shortage was genuine.⁵¹ Consequently, on 15 June 1951, President Truman signed a bill granting India two million tons of grain.⁵²

At the end of the Truman Administration, Indo-US relations had acquired a pattern of chronic friction which puzzled many people. The reasons were however clear. During the Korean War, Indian and American views clashed sharply. Whereas the US perceived a threat world-wide from the USSR and communist countries, and thought that peace could be achieved only through a military approach and collective security, India perceived that the communist menace was exaggerated and East and West were in the grip of mutual fear. It was Nehru's worry that this security perception would not bring peace, but invite war. Peace could be achieved through dialogue but never by force. And thus it was that Indo-US relations got off to a rocky start in the early years of Indian independence.⁵³

⁴⁹ Dennis Kux, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁵⁰ India Faces Food Shortages, *The Canberra Times*, 1 July 1949, National Library of Australia, available at <https://trove.nla.gov.au/newspaper/article/2811575>, accessed on 15 February 2018.

⁵¹ Y. Obi Reddy, 'The US Aid to India: A Study in Foreign Aid Diplomacy 1957-64', *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 58, No. 1, 1997, p. 95.

⁵² R. Passmore, 'Famine in India: An Historical Survey', *The Wider World*, August 18, 1951, p. 307.

⁵³ Dennis Kux, pp. 89- 90.

2.5.2 The Eisenhower Administration

After 20 years of Democratic rule, a Republican – Dwight D. Eisenhower – assumed the presidency in January 1953. He did not change the national security goals of the previous administration but pursued a stronger policy to contain communist adversaries. In pursuit of national security goals, Eisenhower, unlike his predecessor, showed more interest in developing closer links with India.⁵⁴ The American security alliance with Pakistan and military aid to Islamabad upset India and challenged its dominance in the region.⁵⁵ President Eisenhower in a letter to Nehru tried to mitigate India's anger by assuring him personally and publicly that US weapons would not be used against New Delhi and, if used at all, appropriate action would be taken both within and without the UN.⁵⁶ But this did not restrain India from criticising American policy, as became more apparent after the Bandung Conference in 1955.⁵⁷ Relations between the US and India did not improve in Eisenhower's first term and after his re-election in 1956 they continued to have different approaches, for example in relation to communist China where India argued for Chinese entry⁵⁸ to the UN while the US opposed on the grounds that China had not met the required basic norms of international conduct.⁵⁹

Security concerns during the eight years of Eisenhower's Administration led policy makers in Washington to focus increasingly on economic aid to developing countries, of which India was one of the largest recipients.⁶⁰ Despite differences in their foreign policy approaches, the US still had significant interest in India remaining out of communist influence. To pursue this, President Eisenhower granted significantly increased economic aid to New Delhi in 1957.⁶¹ A gradually more positive attitude toward India made their relations run more smoothly. By 1957, Eisenhower became convinced that India's nonalignment policy was not against American interests and he

⁵⁴ Y. Obi Reddy, *op.cit.*, p. 97.

⁵⁵ William J. Barnds, 'India and America at Odds', *International Affairs*, Vol. 49, No. 3, July, 1973, p. 375.

⁵⁶ Dwight D. Eisenhower: 'Letter to Prime Minister Nehru of India Concerning US Military Aid to Pakistan', February 25, 1954. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. Available at <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=10170> accessed on 25 August 2015.

⁵⁷ S. Nihal Singh, 'Can the U.S. and India Be Real Friends?', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 23, No. 9 Sep., 1983, p. 1014.

⁵⁸ Republic of China (ROC) was a founder member of UN and one of five permanent members of UNSC. After Communist revolution in 1949, Mao Tse Tung named it as Peoples Republic of China (PRC). But the government of ROC relocated to Taipei, and the US along with many other states opposed the entry of PRC in the UN. The ROC kept its membership of the UN until October 1971.

⁵⁹ Dennis Kux, *op. cit.*, pp. 141-42.

⁶⁰ Y. Obi Reddy, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

⁶¹ Robert J. McMahon, US Policy toward South Asia and Tibet during the Early Cold War, *op. cit.*, p.140.

even expressed his support for India's staying nonaligned, in stark contradiction of US foreign policy up to that point.⁶² Eisenhower feared the eruption of another Indo-Pak war over Kashmir and, although the administration failed to make India and Pakistan reach a settlement on the conflict, Eisenhower became successful at resolving the Indus Waters dispute. This was negotiated by the World Bank and in order to improve bilateral relations, the US provided funds to cover half the \$1 billion cost of the projects.⁶³

Eisenhower became the first American president to visit India in 1959. He received an unprecedented welcome, stayed four days, spoke to parliament, addressed huge gatherings, attracted crowds with his friendly gestures and broad smile, and had extensive discussions with Nehru, all of which made his trip very successful.⁶⁴ Eisenhower's enthusiasm to support India was described by the New York Times: 'It did not seem to matter much whether Nehru had actually requested or been given a guarantee that the US would help India to meet further Chinese communist aggression. What mattered was the obvious strengthening of Indian-American friendship to a point where no such guarantee was necessary.'⁶⁵

The US gradually came to appreciate India's importance to its grand strategy in the region. They improved relations by personal contact and by recognising the common ground. The respective leaders reached such a good understanding that Nehru believed Eisenhower was much more sympathetic to India than the previous administration, while Eisenhower became convinced that India would never countenance an alliance with USSR. From that point onward, Indo-US relations developed momentum and by the time the Eisenhower presidency was drawing to a close, their relations were increasingly cordial.

2.5.3 The Kennedy Administration and the Indo-China War of 1962

The Kennedy policy toward the sub-continent continued Eisenhower's second administration policy of an increasingly cordial approach to India. President Kennedy

⁶²Dennis Kux, op. cit., p. 154.

⁶³Stephen P. Cohen, 'India and America: An Emerging Relationship', A Paper Presented to the Conference on *The Nation-State System and Transnational Forces in South Asia*, December 8-10, 2000, Kyoto, Japan, p. 7.

⁶⁴Dennis Kux, pp. 157,166.

⁶⁵India and the World, *Panorama*, Synergy Study Point, Vol. 9, 2015, p. 4 available at http://www.upscmantra.com/upsc_images/documents/Vol_9_Current_Events.pdf accessed on 24 Aug. 2015.

extended his hand to India as a senator to provide economic assistance even before becoming president. He appointed a taskforce to ponder over economic aid to India, approved the plan designed by the taskforce, and thus committed \$1 billion per year in grants for the first two years of a third Five Year Plan. He promised to lend to India triple what the Eisenhower Administration had given in 1960.⁶⁶

Kennedy considered India a strategic partner against China and wanted to save India from becoming 'another domino' to fall to communism. In the wake of the Chinese attack in 1962, India asked for help and the US responded positively with Britain to save India from a military disaster.⁶⁷ In May 1963, President Kennedy and Secretary of Defence, Robert McNamara and General Maxwell discussed the feasibility of using nuclear arms in case of a second Chinese attack. Kennedy said, 'We should defend India, and therefore we will defend India' if attacked.⁶⁸ Kennedy believed that it was in the greater US interest to promote India rather than relying entirely on a military alliance with Pakistan, as India was the largest country in the region. The Indo-Chinese war came at a time when the Cold War tension reached an apex. Though the past relationship between India, the US, and the UK since Indian independence was not particularly warm, the latter two did come swiftly to India's aid.⁶⁹

President Kennedy had a deep interest in India and made clear that American would economically assist India, saying 'I want to give you support as well as sympathy' in a letter to Nehru on 28 October 1962.⁷⁰ Nehru replied the next day, 'I am deeply grateful to you for what you have written and for the sympathy and the sympathy of the great nation whose head you are at a moment of difficulty and crisis for us'.⁷¹

The war lasted only a few weeks. But the US continued to provide military assistance to India, while attempting to advance the Kashmir conflict to a settlement. Due to pressure from Washington and London, four rounds of talks between India and Pakistan had

⁶⁶ Dennis Kux, *op. cit.*, pp. 182-6.

⁶⁷ Dheraj Kumar, *op. cit.*, p.6.

⁶⁸ Discussion between President Kennedy and his aides according to newly declassified recordings released by the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum in Boston.

⁶⁹ David R. Devereux, 'The Sino-Indian War of 1962 in Anglo-American Relations', *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 44, No. 1, January 2009, pp. 71, 74-75.

⁷⁰ Telegram From the Department of State to the Embassy in India, Washington, October 28, 1962, available at <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1961-63v19/d187> accessed on 8 August 2015.

⁷¹ Efraim Inbar and Jonathan Rynhold (Eds), *US Foreign Policy and Global Standing in the 21st Century: Realities and Perceptions*, Routledge, 13 Jan 2016, p. 145.

been attempted to settle the Kashmir dispute but they failed to reach to a mutually acceptable agreement. The Kennedy Administration persisted in maintaining a closer relationship with New Delhi without losing or crushing the alliance links with Islamabad even though in the end the US was not able to facilitate a settlement of the Kashmir conflict.⁷²

As a consequence of the improvement in Indo-US relations from 1957-64, the aid flow to India increased. This flow surpassed the amount granted to Pakistan, despite the latter's closer ties. US aid to India was \$364 million in 1957, \$305 million in 1958, and \$758 million in 1960, compared to \$170 million, \$163 million, and \$301 million given to Pakistan over the same period.⁷³ It should be noted that US aid to Pakistan was primarily in military components while India received mainly economic aid. The increasing US aid to India was prompted by the perception that if India lost out to Chinese economic competition, it could mean 450 million people losing out to communism.⁷⁴

J.K. Galbraith – a Harvard Professor and adviser to President Kennedy – served as US Ambassador to India from 1961 to 1963. During this short tenure, he contributed an enormous amount to relations with India, and continued to be a strong advocate for India until his death in April 2006.⁷⁵ He had an extraordinary role and voice in India's war against China in 1962, and played a substantial role in providing US military aid to India.⁷⁶ Realising Nehru's mood, Galbraith regarded the plebiscite on Kashmir as 'out of date and bearing in no practical way to a settlement'.⁷⁷ Galbraith was the original author of Indo-US nuclear cooperation deal in 1962 and he continually pushed Washington hard to increase aid to Nuclear Power Station at Tarapur. This nuclear cooperation deal, aimed at being a great symbol of American high technology assistance

⁷² Dennis Kux, *op. cit.*, pp. 217-8.

⁷³ S.M. Burke and Lawrence Ziring, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Historical Analysis*, Oxford University Press, London, 1990, p. 255.

⁷⁴ Robert J. McMahon, *The Cold War on the Periphery: The United States, India and Pakistan*, *op.cit.*, pp. 219-20.

⁷⁵ Harish Khare, 'A Friend of India', *The Hindu*, New Delhi, May 1, 2006.

⁷⁶ Ramachandra Guha, 'Galbraith and India - Certainly the most imposing of all US Ambassadors to India', *The Telegraph*, Calcutta, May 27, 2006.

⁷⁷ U.S. Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1961-1963*.

to India, subsequently became an obstacle to their relations in the 1970s when India tested its nuclear weapons.⁷⁸

2.5.4 The Indo-Pak War (Second Kashmir War) of 1965 and the Johnson Administration

Johnson became president after the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963. He inherited a strained relationship with Pakistan and cordial relations with India as the United States was providing economic and some military aid to India in the wake of the Indo-China War. The situation demanded US attention toward repairing relations with Pakistan. On the second day of Johnson's presidency, Robert Komer, of the NSC, wanted the president's approval for the proposal to aid India with arms. The president refused any further approval of military assistance but the programme of military aid approved by the previous administration continued until the war of 1965 which was known as the Second Kashmir War.⁷⁹

The Kashmir dispute was a continuous irritation in Indo-US relations. When the war broke out, the US expressed its deep concern as the war not only created a threat to the peace in the region but also posed a potential threat to the world if it should involve other states in the war.⁸⁰ The United States suspended arms shipments to both the parties and the embargo continued during the next Indo-Pak War of 1971.⁸¹

The war deteriorated Indo-US relations further as, despite firm assurances from the US government (in a letter to Nehru from President Eisenhower) that Pakistan would not use US weapons against India, India noticed that US-supplied arms were heavily used in the war and every single casualty on the Indian side was caused by American arms.⁸²

Since the Johnson Administration was overwhelmed in the Vietnam War, the primary goal of America was to stop the war through UN negotiations. The US urged the warring states to obey the UN appeals to pull back to the ceasefire line of 1949. However, because of its pre-occupations elsewhere the US supported Soviet attempt to

⁷⁸ Dennis Kux, *op. cit.*, pp. 187-89.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* pp. 227-31.

⁸⁰ Arthur G. Goldberg, US Representative in the UN Security Council on 18 September 1965, *Department of State Bulletin*, 11 October 1965, p. 603.

⁸¹ Stephen P. Cohen, 'Pakistan and the Cold War' in Chandra Chari (ed.), *Superpower Rivalry and Conflict: The long shadow of the Cold War on the twenty-first century*, Routledge, London & New York, 2010, p. 77.

⁸² Chester Bowles, *Promises to Keep: My Years in Public Life, 1941-1969*, Harper & Row, New York, 1971, p. 503.

negotiate the conflict, contrary to the age-old policy of containing Soviet influence in the region.⁸³ In January 1966, Prime Minister Alexsei Kosygin invited Lal Bahadur Shastri and Ayub Khan to Tashkent and, after negotiations, they signed the Tashkent Declaration. The declaration ended the war and both countries withdrew their forces to pre-war ceasefire lines. The declaration bound them to settle the conflict on Kashmir through peaceful means under the UN Charter.⁸⁴

The five years of Johnson's presidency witnessed a major shift in Indo-US relations. Because of India's criticism of the Vietnam War, and the tensions during the second Kashmir war, the Johnson Administration decided to use economic pressure on New Delhi to reform agriculture policies and liberalise India's national economy and to increase access for foreign investment. In this period, disappointed by the failure of its attempts to bring the two hostile neighbours into a negotiating table to settle their main dispute – Kashmir – the US 'for all practical purposes lost interest in India' and disengaged from South Asia.⁸⁵

2.5.5 The Nixon-Kissinger Approach, the Bangladesh War, and India's First Nuclear Test

After assuming office in 1969, President Nixon criticised the preceding administration for the ineffectiveness of its policies. He believed that the changing international system needed a 'fresh approach' to meet the challenges. The primary concern of his administration was to wind down the Vietnam War. As discussed above, the United States lost its interest in South Asia after 1965 due to its failure in bringing India and Pakistan together to settle the dispute over Kashmir. The Nixon Administration from the beginning, however, wanted to maintain good relations with both of them. Nixon wrote to Henry Kissinger 'our policy objective on the subcontinent was, quite simply, to avoid adding another complication to our agenda.'⁸⁶

But there was no denial that President Nixon's strategic concern in South Asia was to limit Soviet and Chinese influence in the region. The main interest of the US in South Asia remained promoting their economies, providing humanitarian assistance and, on

⁸³PrithviRamMudiam, *op. cit.*, p. 266

⁸⁴Rathnam, Indurthy, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-38.

⁸⁵David Denoon, *Devaluation Under Pressure: India, Indonesia, and Ghana*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986.

⁸⁶Henry Kissinger, *The White House Years*, Little Brown, Boston, 1979, p 848.

top of everything, encouraging them to giving up their differences. Two events within a short period made the region occupy a central focus in American foreign policy. One was the 1971 Indo-Pak War and the other was Nixon's efforts of rapprochement with China.⁸⁷

In 1971, South Asia saw a third Indo-Pak war, just six years after the second war, known as the Liberation War of Bangladesh. This war ended up with Indian involvement, resulted in the dismemberment of Pakistan, with East Pakistan becoming the new country of Bangladesh. India played a vital role in the emergence of Bangladesh. India had wanted to divide and weaken Pakistan since its independence in 1947, and the people of East Pakistan needed India's help to get rid of political suppression, economic exploitation, and cultural infiltration from West Pakistan. So it was 'hand-in-glove' situation.⁸⁸ An Indian scholar Professor S.D. Muni said it was a war for India's sake. India fought its own war and the people of Bangladesh became independent out of the Indo-Pak eternal rivalry.⁸⁹

The Liberation war of Bangladesh in 1971 strained Indo-US relations, as President Nixon was positively disposed toward an integrated Pakistan. During this time, Islamabad extended help to the Nixon Administration's efforts to normalise and improve relations with Beijing, even arranging Henry Kissinger's secret visit to Beijing in 1971 via Pakistan. In the past, Pakistan's efforts to develop closer relations with China had made the US seriously concerned, but now the Nixon Administration utilized and received benefit from Pakistan's efforts. Although other ways existed for the US to communicate with China, the Pakistan channel proved the most successful and for this President Nixon became enormously grateful to Pakistan. On 7 August 1971, President Nixon sent a handwritten letter of gratitude to President Yahya, in which he said: 'Those who want a more peaceful world in the generations to come will forever be in your debt.'⁹⁰

⁸⁷ Dennis Kux, *op. cit.*, p. 289.

⁸⁸ Satish Kumar, 'The Evolution of India's Policy towards Bangladesh in 1971', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 15, No. 6, 1975, p. 488.

⁸⁹ The emergence of Bangladesh as an independent nation has been described as 'second liberation for India' for it made the nation 'more secure than it ever was'. See Pran Chopra, *India's Second Liberation*, Delhi, 1973, pp. 3-4.

⁹⁰ Geoffrey Warner, 'Nixon, Kissinger and the Breakup of Pakistan, 1971', *International Affairs*, Vol. 81, No.5, 2005, pp. 1100-1.

The Bangladesh crisis took place at a time when America was busy courting China, and its action during the crisis was reactive. The Bangladesh crisis was a secondary priority to the US, and its attempt to mediate the crisis with 'preventive diplomacy' proved unsuccessful.⁹¹ From the Chinese perspective, the independence of Bangladesh was a threat to the territorial integrity of its ally, Pakistan. The United States, like China, showed great concern for the territorial integrity of Pakistan. Nixon and Kissinger believed India was planning to defeat Pakistani forces and its military capability, permanently crippling the country and ensuring it could never again raise a hand against India.⁹² It extended oral support to Pakistan but failed to preserve Pakistan's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Despite its support for an integrated Pakistan, it had to accept the inevitability of the emergence of Bangladesh by dismantling united Pakistan.⁹³

Since the US saw the inevitability of an independent Bangladesh, Nixon and Kissinger found no logic in being part of a civil war but they wanted to protect their ally, as a break up of Pakistan would have damaging consequences for the integrity of the US alliance.⁹⁴ The Nixon/Kissinger/Chou Enlai approach involved checking Indian power and creating a Sino-American condominium in the region. They pursued the same policy even after Pakistan's disintegration in 1971.⁹⁵ While major powers in the world condemned West Pakistan for its repression of East Pakistanis, Nixon/Kissinger policy still tilted toward it. They clearly saw India as the major threat to the US policy of detente. When the crisis was deepening and the situation was deteriorating rapidly, President Nixon sent the US Seventh Fleet to the Bay of Bengal, badly damaging Indo-US relations.⁹⁶

During the Bangladesh War in 1971, Indo-US relations deteriorated and reached a new low point. The Nixon/Kissinger policy of tilting toward Pakistan was influenced by Pakistan's friendly relations with China, with the belief that defending Pakistan could improve US relations with China, which the US was treating as counterweight to its

⁹¹ Robert S. Litwak, *Détente and the Nixon Doctrine: American Foreign Policy and the Pursuit of Stability, 1969-1976*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1984, p.103.

⁹² Ralph A. Becker, Master Thesis on *A Cold War Episode: Détente And U.S. Relations With Pakistan During The 1971 South Asia Crisis*, University Of Northern Colorado, 2012, p. 6.

⁹³ Henry Kissinger, *The White House Years*, pp. 842-918.

⁹⁴ Ralph A. Becker, Master Thesis on *A Cold War Episode: Détente And U.S. Relations With Pakistan During The 1971 South Asia Crisis*, University Of Northern Colorado, 2012, p. 41.

⁹⁵ Ashok Kapur, *India – From Regional to World Power*, Routledge, New York, 2006, p. 10.

⁹⁶ Jarrod Hayes, 'Securitization, Social Identity, and Democratic Security: Nixon, India, and the Ties That Bind', *International Organization*, Vol. 66, Issues 1, 2012, pp. 74-75.

only rival superpower, the Soviet Union. Whatever gains this policy brought for the US in a wider context, one consequence was to worsen relations with India.⁹⁷

The US attitude during the 1971 crisis left India somewhat melancholy. When the crisis was over, the United States wanted to repair the damaged relations and rebuild the normal contacts it had enjoyed with India during the period of the Indo-Chinese War. As part of the positive measures, President Nixon chose as ambassador to India the Harvard Professor Daniel P. Moynihan, who had publicly opposed US policy during the Bangladesh war.⁹⁸

Moynihan envisaged rightly that the long-term economic interests of India needed 'close and correct' relations with the US, and, for this, he suggested building good relations with the US and minimising their political differences. He was popular amongst Indians due to his positive attitudes toward India. As stated earlier, the US lost interest in South Asia in the 1970s, resulting in less than one per cent of US overseas investments going to the region, in what Moynihan labelled 'benign neglect' of South Asia. Ambassador Moynihan persuaded the administration to cancel a significant amount of India's debt owed to the US for foodstuffs.⁹⁹

In 1974, India tested nuclear bombs in Pokhran, which made India the world's sixth nuclear power. The explosion indicated India's reluctance to obey the nuclear policy of the superpowers,¹⁰⁰ inciting the anger of members of the US Congress. The US State Department criticised the detonation as a breach of the principles of non-proliferation. India saw the NPT as 'discriminatory', imposing different sets of rules on the 'haves' and 'have nots', and consistently remained committed to its policy that 'the country's national security in a world of nuclear proliferation lies either in global disarmament or in exercise of the principle of equal and legitimate security for all'.¹⁰¹

In an immediate reaction to the test, Pakistani Premier Bhutto declared that Pakistan was going to conduct its own, as he thought the aim of the test was to 'employ nuclear

⁹⁷ Bill Finan, 'Nuclear Diplomacy Up Close: Strobe Talbott on the Clinton Administration and India', *India Review*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 85-86.

⁹⁸ Dennis Kux, pp. 308-9.

⁹⁹ Arthur G. Rubinoff, 'Changing Perceptions of India in the US Congress', pp. 44-45.

¹⁰⁰ Y.K Malik & D.K Malik, *India: The Years of India Gandhi*, (ed.), E.J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands, 1987, p. 51.

¹⁰¹ T.V. Paul, *The India-Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Rivalry*, Cambridge University Press, 2005, p.241.

blackmail against Pakistan'.¹⁰² When Ambassador Moynihan saw Indira Gandhi to present the official reaction of the US to the test, he added some personal thoughts, telling the Prime Minister:

India has made a huge mistake. Here you were the No. 1 hegemonic power in South Asia. Nobody was No. 2 and call Pakistan No. 3. Now in a decade's time, some Pakistani general will call you up and say I have four nuclear weapons and I want Kashmir. If not, we will drop them on you and we will all meet in heaven. And then what will you do.¹⁰³

Ambassador Galbraith and Ambassador Moynihan had been very sympathetic to India and Indians. They utilised their capacities to promote India's interests vis-à-vis the rest of the world. They tried to bring India closer to the United States when they were in India as ambassadors, and even after returning to the US they continued their support for India's cause and maintained interactions until their deaths. They have been remembered and continued to be remembered by the people of India and by people who support India's interests.

2.5.6 The Ford Administration

President Gerald Ford assumed office in August 1974 upon the resignation of President Nixon because of the Watergate Scandal. He assumed the presidency at a time when the US was about to lose in Vietnam and finally lost it within nine months of his office. President Ford nationally also faced the worst economic crisis in forty years of history, since the Great Depression in 1929.

Despite Washington's efforts to normalise its relation with New Delhi, most probably it was not possible to achieve the objective as long as President Nixon remained in office. As mentioned above, the US almost disengaged itself from South Asia in the early 1970s, and the idea of balancing India and Pakistan was left out of the US agenda, but the nuclear test, conducted by India in 1974, drew the attention of the Ford Administration.¹⁰⁴ Since the Ford Administration had limited experience in dealing with sub-continental affairs, he continued Nixon's policy of providing economic and military aid to Islamabad.¹⁰⁵ To ease Cold War tensions, he continued the policy of détente with

¹⁰² Dennis Kux, p. 315.

¹⁰³ Phillip Margulies, *Nuclear Non-proliferation*, Facts On File Inc, New York, 2008, p. 70.

¹⁰⁴ Rudra Chaudhuri, 'Balancing US Interests in India and Pakistan', *The International Spectator: Italian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 46, No. 2, p. 77.

¹⁰⁵ Arun Kumar, India's 1974 Nuclear Test Hurt Ties: US, *Hindustan Times*, December 22, 2007.

both the USSR and China. The rapprochement with China was reinforced by President Ford, who visited the country in December 1975.¹⁰⁶ South Asia did not occupy important place in the foreign policy of Ford Administration so much as the détente with the Soviet Union, the Middle East, and Indo-China did. In late 1974, Kissinger visited India for three days to repair the damaged relations with New Delhi, but the outcome was not satisfactory

Although there were few incentives for Washington to seek improved relations, American interests still put a limit on how bad things should get. The US felt that it could not afford to entirely ignore India, even if, during the two-year Ford presidency there was only a limited desire to find a *modus vivendi*. Indo-US relations received another jolt with the declaration of an emergency in India, when the High Court of India declared Indira Gandhi's election null and void. An emergency was declared to save Indira Gandhi's premiership.¹⁰⁷ The United States government was angered by the growing authoritarianism and political suppression and President Ford refused to visit India as long the emergency was in place.¹⁰⁸ The criticism by the United States of the declaration of emergency in India in June of that year was also seriously disliked by India. There was a sharp reaction from the Indian Government and from Mrs Gandhi, who objected to what she saw as interference in India's internal affairs. The decision taken by the United States in 1975 to lift the ten-year-old lethal arms embargo on South Asia was another obstruction for Indo-US relations. This decision forced a very strong reaction from India and resulted in the cancellation of the scheduled visit of its foreign minister to the US.¹⁰⁹

2.5.7 The Carter Period and Soviet Intervention in Afghanistan

President Carter assumed office in 1977 and during his term he faced continuing recession, energy crises, and inflation. The US people wanted Carter to be a trusted hero but he projected himself as a 'redeemer president' rather than a hero, and promised a new 'openness of government, closeness between the president and the people

¹⁰⁶Paul Coyer, Congress, China and the Cold War: Domestic Politics and Sino-American Rapprochement and Normalisation, 1969-1980, *PhD Thesis*, The London School of Economics and Political Science, 2013, p. 160.

¹⁰⁷ Y.K Malik & D.K Vajpeyi (Eds.), *India: The Years of Indira Gandhi*, E.J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands, 1988, p.15.

¹⁰⁸ Ford made his statement on September 18, 1975, *Facts on File*, 1975, pp. 712-3.

¹⁰⁹Dheeraj Kumar, *op. cit.*, p.5

themselves'.¹¹⁰ He promised a stable, just, and peaceful world order. In his inaugural address he proclaimed: 'We will not seek to dominate nor dictate to others'. He promised a defence spending cut of around five to seven billion dollars of the total defence budget, and announced his foreign policy would be 'free of that inordinate fear of communism'.¹¹¹ He followed a policy of what Brzezinski called 'constructive global engagement' which consisted of five basic principles. These were: first and foremost, a commitment to human rights as the fundamental root of all policy; second, the promotion of increased links and cooperation with other democracies; third, engaging with the Soviet Union in a joint effort to limit and then reduce their arsenals of strategic arms; fourth, to seek an enduring peace in the Middle East; and fifth; to address the threat of nuclear proliferation.¹¹²

India was given a higher priority under the Carter Administration than under Nixon or Ford. As a part of his presidential campaign for adopting a stronger attitude toward the proliferation of nuclear weapons, he asked for a major review of nuclear policy. He criticised the Ford Administration for a soft and weak reaction to India's nuclear explosion in 1974 and pondered how to respond to the enriched uranium at the Tarapur power plant.¹¹³ The issue became a prominent pivot on which future Indo-US relations would depend. In view of the Non-Proliferation Act passed by Congress in 1978, the Carter administration began to back out of its commitment to supply uranium, and started insisting on a fresh agreement which would provide for international inspection of all the nuclear energy plants in India.¹¹⁴

The restoration of democracy under the Janata government was highly appreciated by President Carter. He, like Kennedy, considered India a key country in the subcontinent. Since there was no major conflict in the international arena, the atmosphere seemed very conducive for the Carter Administration to take favourable steps in improving US relations with India.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁰ Jon Roper, *The American Presidents: Heroic Leadership from Kennedy to Clinton*, Edinburgh University Press, 2000, pp. 125-6.

¹¹¹ John Dumbrell, *American Foreign Policy: Carter to Clinton*, McMillan Press, 1997, p.11.

¹¹² Trevor B. McCrisken, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-61.

¹¹³ Dennis Kux, *op. cit.*, p. 345.

¹¹⁴ J. Michael Martinez, 'The Carter Administration and the Evolution of American Nuclear Nonproliferation Policy, 1977-1981', *The Journal Of Policy History*, Vol. 14, No. 3, 2002, p. 278.

¹¹⁵ M. Srinivas Chary, *The Eagle and the Peacock: U.S. Foreign Policy Toward India Since Independence*, Greedwood Press, Wesport, United States, 1995, p. 149.

Believing India to be a key country in South Asia, President Carter thought India should be brought back into the international community of nations in a way that would be advantageous to the US. To improve US relations with India, he visited India in January 1978, signalling a policy shift to usher a new phase in Indo-US relations. As a part of this policy shift and normalizing relations with New Delhi, he discontinued aid to Pakistan. With his visit, the bilateral aid, suspended since 1971, was also resumed and a 60 million dollar aid package was sanctioned by Congress, which also agreed to supply the fuel for the Tarapur Plant.¹¹⁶ Though President Carter's warm welcome to India was a public relations triumph, and Carter was obviously inclined to look India as the leader of the region, the elation of the visit did not last long.

The world was astonished when, on 25 December 1979, Soviet troops invaded Afghanistan. The invasion was recognised as one of the critical events of the Cold War history. The Soviet claimed it was not an invasion, as they had been invited by the Afghan leadership to help maintain Hafizullah Amin's government. Within a few hours, the Amin's regime had been toppled, Amin was killed, and Barbak Kamal was installed instead. The Soviets remained in Afghanistan for almost ten years.¹¹⁷

Following the invasion, the Cold War again became the order of the day, and the Carter Administration essentially reverted to containment as its guiding principle. Carter felt a moral obligation to help the people of Afghanistan and also became concerned that it would endanger Pakistan's integrity. He promised to defend Pakistan's territorial integrity and provided all sorts of help including military equipment and food. Later, in March 1980, however, President Carter granted only \$400 million in economic and military assistance to Pakistan over the subsequent two years, prompting a furious reaction from the Pakistani leadership, who rejected the offer as peanuts.¹¹⁸ General Zia of Pakistan wanted huge military aid to counter its enemy, India.¹¹⁹

There were mixed reactions in India to the Soviet invasion. The Indian government showed its anger. In Kux's view, it was just words as no firm stand was taken against

¹¹⁶ J. Michael Martinez, *op. cit.*, pp. 275, 277.

¹¹⁷ Richard Crockatt, *The Fifty Years War: The United States and the Soviet Union in World Politics, 1941-1991*, Routledge, London, 1995, p. 286.

¹¹⁸ The United States and Pakistan's Quest for the Bomb, *Newly Declassified Documents Disclose Carter Administration's Unsuccessful Efforts to Roll Back Islamabad's Secret Nuclear Program*, National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book No. 333, The George Washington University, Posted - December 21, 2010, available at <http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb333/>, accessed on 7 March 2016.

¹¹⁹ Angelo Rasanayagam, *Afghanistan: A Modern History Monarchy, Despotism or Democracy? The Problems of Governance in the Muslim Tradition*, I. B. Tauris, London, 2002, pp. 104-5.

the invasion. On the other hand, a number of Indians were actually happy about the invasion. The main worry for them was not the Soviet presence in Afghanistan but the revival of US military assistance to Pakistan which would threaten India's broader interests.¹²⁰

With the start of the Carter presidency, there were great hopes in India that the United States would be taking steps to build positive relations with India as the latter ended its emergency rule and posed a balanced attitude to non-alignment, especially as Washington was maintaining its distance from Islamabad and cutting military aid to Pakistan. In addition, the US also recognised India as the key country in the region and paid more attention to it, with an emphasis on democracy and human rights. India's reaction to the Soviet invasion made Indo-US relations a little bitter. But at the end, however, Carter did his best to help India in getting clearance for two pending applications for uranium before leaving the White House.¹²¹

2.5.8 The Reagan Administration

When President Carter proved himself neither the hero nor the leader the United States required,¹²² President Reagan assumed office in 1981 on the crest of an emotional wave, promising a change in the direction of US foreign policy. He had been elected to reverse US decline (or, at least, the perception of decline).¹²³ Reagan marked the restoration of the failing economy as the first priority in national policy, and the reassertion of American military power in foreign and defence policy as the number one priority in reaffirming its leadership of the world.¹²⁴ He found, however, that he had difficulty in asserting an effective foreign policy at first due to a decline in US military capacity, for which he blamed Carter. He therefore increased the defence budget with the intention of reversing the US decline. Reagan was usually called a 'hawk' by the Soviets (though they did not consider Carter a 'dove') and there was a perception that his election to the presidency might lead to further deterioration of the US relationship with the USSR.¹²⁵

¹²⁰ Dennis Kux, pp. 366, 370.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 374.

¹²² Jon Roper, *op. cit.*, p. 140

¹²³ John Dumbrell, *American Foreign Policy: Carter to Clinton*, p. 126.

¹²⁴ M. Srinivas Chary, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

¹²⁵ President Reagan and American Foreign Policy, A Special Booklet, Chatham House, The Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, January, 1981, pp. 6, 9.

As the final year of the Carter Administration left Indo-US relations in bitter state, President Reagan found US relations with India strained and stressed. New issues and conflicts brought to head the differences between the US and India, like the Afghan crisis and issues in the Indian Ocean. In particular, India's soft criticism of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan made the Reagan Administration suspicious. President Reagan never took India's non-alignment policy as genuine neutrality. His tougher policy toward the Soviet Union, and India's tilt toward the USSR, impaired better Indo-US relations. However, the Reagan Administration aimed at a new shift in the substance and conduct of US policy to India.¹²⁶

Undoubtedly, the Soviet intervention and its prolonged presence in Afghanistan was considered a serious regional problem that challenged the US 1970s policy of keeping major rivals out of the region.¹²⁷ President Reagan was determined to punish the Soviets as much as possible for its unlawful invasion. He provided huge amounts of cash and weapons to the Afghans for stiff resistance against the Soviets. He promised \$3.2 billion in economic and military aid to Islamabad for six years and an option to sell 40 advanced F-16 fighter jets to serve Pakistan in acting as a frontline state in covert operations to 'roll back' what President Reagan named 'the evil empire'.¹²⁸

Indo-US relations worsened with Reagan establishing Pakistan as a 'frontline state' against the USSR in Afghanistan, but, paradoxically, the heat of the second Cold War melted the coldness in their relations.¹²⁹ The signs of improvement in Indo-US ties were discernible during Reagan's second term, when, in December 1984, a month after Rajiv Gandhi assumed the premiership, India and the United States finalised a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on technological cooperation which was eventually signed in May 1985.¹³⁰

Two terms of the Reagan Administration saw increased high-level contacts and dialogue between India and America. India's two Prime Ministers over the time period, Indira Gandhi and her son Rajiv Gandhi, visited the United States three times and from the US side the Vice-President, Secretary of State, two Secretaries of Defence and a

¹²⁶Dheeraj Kumar, op. cit. p.5.

¹²⁷Stephen P. Cohen, 'Right for the Right Reasons? The Reagan Administration and India', *India International Centre Quarterly*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 1988, p. 34.

¹²⁸Angelo Rasanayagam, pp. 105, 218.

¹²⁹K..Balasundaram, PhD Thesis on *The Pursuit of Cooperation: US Policy towards India during the Reagan Administration*, Pondicherry University, India, 2000, p. 251.

¹³⁰Dennis Kux, p. 401.

number of other cabinet ministers visited India. By the final year of the Reagan Administration, mutual understanding between them reached such a productive level, and, by that time, they had learned what they should or should not ask from each other.¹³¹ After eight years of the Reagan presidency, the US suppressed the differences with India that had arisen on various issues. In 1987, the Reagan Administration supported the Indian intervention in Sri Lanka, even agreeing to supply substantial high tech sales of jet engines for LCA aircraft and Cray supercomputers. From analysing the Reagan Administration's attitude to India, it becomes clear that their relationship was sometimes good, sometimes bad; to use Dennis Kux's phrase, it was 'paradoxical', though the good times predominated.¹³²

2.5.9 George H. W. Bush

George H. W. Bush assumed the presidency in January 1989 when the 45 years of Cold War were coming to an end, and America's only rival in superpower challenge, the Soviet Union, was in the process of disintegrating. Bush came to power on the crest of a popularity wave left behind by the Reagan Administration, just as Reagan had arrived on an emotional wave. During his presidential campaign, Bush made clear to his people that he saw no need to 'remake society' or take the country in 'radical new directions'.¹³³ He was determined to consolidate the achievements his predecessor had made. He was more reactive than assertive. He remained true to Reaganism throughout. In many aspects, President Bush emerged as 'Reagan's shadow', best described by John Dumbrell as a 'loyal disciple' of Ronald Reagan.¹³⁴

George H.W. Bush is regarded as the last president of America with prior foreign policy experience. During his tenure, President Bush devoted most of his time to foreign affairs; his time as vice-president, together with his earlier service at the UN and his tenure as Director of CIA, gave him significant experience in international affairs. His presidency was marked by a remarkable run of successes in the international arena. He

¹³¹ K.. Balasundaram, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

¹³² Chidanand Rajghatta, 'Reagan and India: Great Expectations', *The Times of India*, June 6, 2004.

¹³³ Trevor B. McCrisken, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

¹³⁴ John Dumbrell, *American Foreign Policy: Carter to Clinton*, p. 130

left office with some extraordinary achievements, such as managing the peaceful collapse of the former USSR and the reunification of Germany.¹³⁵

President Bush did not make any basic changes in US foreign policy toward the subcontinent as there was significant uncertainty in international relations at the time. Policies like maintaining security relations with Pakistan, preventing the spread of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs), improving security relations with India, and mediating the Kashmir conflict were maintained.¹³⁶

When, in 1988, Gorbachev indicated his wish to withdraw Soviet troops from Afghanistan, the CIA initially dismissed him by saying it was ‘just talk, just another... attempt to deceive us’.¹³⁷ But later, when Moscow started to implement the decision to withdraw forces, Bush, as vice-president, said the Soviet policy of withdrawing was the result of ‘our strength’, and ‘our resolve’.¹³⁸ With the withdrawal, the United States started to see South Asia through a different set of lenses, and not necessarily through the prism of the Cold War. No doubt, the withdrawal significantly reduced American interest in the region. The US continued providing military aid to Pakistan to pass onto Islamic forces, to match the on-going Soviet support to the Afghan government, but Pakistan lost its frontline state status.¹³⁹ The irony is that, after pampering Pakistan’s leaderships at various times as an advantageous ally during the Cold War period, the US now started detaching itself from Islamabad.¹⁴⁰

US relations with Pakistan fluctuated on the basis of rise and fall of Pakistan’s strategic value. Soviet withdrawal of its troops from Afghanistan made Pakistan less important to the US strategic calculus. Although Islamabad lost its frontline status, Washington had to maintain close relationship with it to contain Soviet influence in Afghanistan and US military operation in the Gulf. Pakistan extended its support to America in its military operation in the Gulf War,¹⁴¹ and the Bush administration discounted Islamabad’s secret development of nuclear weapons as a quid pro quo. It continued commercial military

¹³⁵ James Goldgeiger, ‘George H.W. Bush: America’s last foreign policy president’, *The Conversation*, 12 June 2017.

¹³⁶ David. S. Chou, ‘US Policy toward India and Pakistan in the Post Cold War Era’ in *US Policy toward South Asia in the Post-Cold War Era*, Sheng-Chih Book Co. Ltd, Taipei, 2003, p. 29.

¹³⁷ John Dumbrell, *American Foreign Policy: Carter to Clinton*, p. 9

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 116

¹³⁹ Dennis Kux, *op. cit.*, p. 425.

¹⁴⁰ Michael Cox, *US Foreign Policy after the Cold War: Superpower without a Mission*, Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, 1995, p. 114.

¹⁴¹ David. S. Chou, *op. Cit.* p. 30.

sales to Pakistan, contravening its own sanctions policy that had nonetheless reduced its influence in Pakistan. When finally the Soviet troops were withdrawn, the civil war in Afghanistan became the order of the day, the United States interest in Pakistan declined dramatically.

It has been discussed above that the Cold War context hampered United States' efforts to improve relations with India brought limited success because they were always subject to the strategic goal of containing Soviet communism and because New Delhi was not prepared to improve its relation with Washington at the cost of alienating Moscow. The end of the Cold War allowed both the US and India to view each other outside of the restrictive Cold War paradigm. One consequence was the development of improved security links. For the first time, under the Bush administration, in 1991, the navies of both countries mounted a joint exercise in the Indian Ocean called Malabar 92.¹⁴²

President Bush Sr. was familiar, from his experience, with the issues in South Asia. Bush's policy of building better relations with India was evident in the number of visits to India by US officials, such as the visit in December 1990 led by Henry Rowen, Assistant Secretary of Defence, which was followed by the visit to the US by an Indian delegation in August 1991. At the beginning of 1991, the Commanding General of the US Army in the Pacific went to New Delhi for a discussion with the Indian Naval Chief, where they cleared the ground for continuing 'forces to forces' level contacts, and discussed a range of other security issues. It became clear that Bush Sr. wanted to involve India in the various issues that the international community faced, keeping in mind the need to serve the national security interests of both states.¹⁴³

In Kux's view, despite the US success worldwide and changes in Indian economic policy, President Bush's tendency toward a closer bilateral engagement was not successful. The problem of nuclear proliferation and competition and between India and Pakistan on the nuclear issue remained a high priority but the United States was not clear on how it would fit India into the changed global situation and into the 'New

¹⁴²*Ibid.* p. 35.

¹⁴³ Sharif Shuja, 'The United States and India', *International Journal on World Peace*, Vol. 23, No.2 June 2006, pp. 38-40.

World Order'. The Indo-US bilateral relationship therefore, while seeming outwardly friendly remained deeply ambivalent below the surface.¹⁴⁴

2.6 Policy Shift under the Clinton Administration toward the Region

The end of the Cold War changed dramatically the long-established rules in international relations, the global equations for all countries, and the US approach to international politics. When Clinton came to office in January 1993, the United States discovered itself in a position in international politics where there was no significant rival. Therefore, he was able to focus on US domestic concerns. His top priority was to get the economy moving again from recession to recovery.¹⁴⁵

The end of the Cold war facilitated the US in having a new kind of relationship with India with a new vision. Though their relationship in the past was not always cordial, the United States recognised the importance of India, due to its large population, geographical location, political system, world vision, outlook and other factors that provide the basis for a long-lasting strategic relationship with the US.

Talbot takes the view that, when Clinton assumed the presidency, he was sincere in taking firm actions to move beyond the Cold War perspective. He was determined to alter the dictum of 'you are either with us or against us' which pushed many countries like India into Washington's peripheral vision. Clinton was an optimist about revitalising US relations with India, but that enthusiasm took a long time to be translated into substantive action.¹⁴⁶ At the outset of his presidency, President Clinton did not pay much attention to the South Asian region, though he established the new Bureau of South Asian Affairs. The early period of Clinton's office witnessed a strained Indo-US relationship. For example, repeated comments by Robin Raphel, the new and first Assistant Secretary of State for South and Central Asian Affairs, angered India by commenting, on 28 October 1993, that India's rule over Kashmir was illegitimate. In September 1993, Clinton himself said in the General Assembly that New Delhi violated human rights in Kashmir. However, in the beginning of 1994 he changed his attitude

¹⁴⁴ Dennis Kux, *op. cit.*, pp. 444-5.

¹⁴⁵ John Dumbrell, *Clinton's Foreign Policy: Between the Bushes, 1992-2000*, Routledge, 2009, p. 169.

¹⁴⁶ Bill Finan, *op. cit.*, pp.87-88.

and adjusted his policy toward the region. He tried to calm India and Pakistan over the Kashmir dispute.¹⁴⁷

The years from 1991 to 2001 were a truly transformative decade in Indo-US bilateral relations. There were a number of factors that led President Clinton to improve Washington's relations with New Delhi. Firstly, the end of the Cold War removed the US concern about India's relationship with the USSR, and the collapse of the Soviet Union abolished India's foreign policy foundation of non-alignment and disrupted its supply of defence equipment. New Delhi also began to learn, somewhat painfully, that it could no longer disregard the only superpower in the world. Secondly, Islamabad lost its importance after the withdrawal of Soviet troops, while New Delhi rose in importance to Washington in its role of mediating peace and security in the region. Thirdly, in response to a growing domestic economic crisis, India launched a much-belated exercise in 1991 to liberalise its economy, and began to ease rules of investment, tariffs and taxes, causing the US to view India as a huge potential market. Fourthly, the United States, as the world's oldest democracy, had a closer affinity to the largest democracy, India, than it did to Pakistan. Lastly, the geopolitical and geostrategic location of India was a significant consideration in Clinton's policy toward it.¹⁴⁸

Because of the above factors, the United States showed increasing indifference toward Pakistan and started to move closer to India, with President Clinton feeling that there was a serious need for the policies of past administrations toward India to be reformed.¹⁴⁹ From 1994 onward, he took steps toward this, and started supporting New Delhi in its role as a regional power. In May 1994, Prime Minister Rao visited the United States and had talks with President Clinton on economic and trade cooperation, and deliberately avoided discussions of human rights or nuclear proliferation issues. In January 1995, William Perry, the US Defence Secretary, visited India and signed a security agreement which was regarded as a breakthrough in Indo-US bilateral relations.¹⁵⁰ The US tilt toward India became clear after Vajpayee's visit to Washington in 2000. Although the United States tried to maintain neutrality in its public stance, it had clearly distanced itself from Pakistan in choosing India as its primary ally. In the

¹⁴⁷ David. S. Chou, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

¹⁴⁹ Michael Cox, *op. cit.*, p. 16

¹⁵⁰ David. S. Chou, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

latter years of the Clinton administration this tilt was reinforced by developments such as the nuclearisation of South Asia, the Talibanization of Afghanistan, and the rise of Islamic fundamentalism.

India astonished the United States and the world in May 1998 by exploding nuclear weapons. Washington strongly condemned the explosion and tried, and failed, to stop Pakistan doing the same. Consequently, the United States imposed sanctions on both countries. Following the explosion, the Clinton Administration became engaged in the extended dialogue that took place before, during, and after the Kargil War in 1999.¹⁵¹ There were nine rounds of talks between Strobe Talbot and Jaswant Singh. Finally, President Clinton forcefully intervened in mid-1999 to get Islamabad to withdraw its forces that had been sent across the Line of Control (LoC) in Kashmir. This was a welcome intervention for India, which had thought that the US would support Islamabad instead.¹⁵² This was the first time in history that the US unequivocally supported India against Pakistan. It has opened the door to the strategic realignment of the US toward India, and it was undoubtedly a political victory for India.¹⁵³

The final year of the 20th century shaped Indo-US relations at the start of the 21st century. President Clinton visited South Asia in March 2000 – the first visit by an American president for 22 years. He stayed five days in India and only five hours in Pakistan, giving momentum to Indo-US relations. Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee visited United States in September of the same year and spoke to a joint session of the US Congress. These exchange visits from the apex of the respective leaderships was the opening of a new chapter in their relationship and indicated a major shift in their foreign policies.¹⁵⁴ Washington took further substantial measures toward enhancing and improving relations with New Delhi, such as undertaking joint military exercises.¹⁵⁵

On the basis of Indo-US mutual interests and recognising their responsibilities toward ensuring regional stability and global security, President Clinton and Prime Minister Vajpayee signed a Vision Document and declared their ‘resolve to create a closer and

¹⁵¹ Stephen P. Cohen and Sunil Dasgupta, *Arming without Aiming: India's Military Modernization*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, D.C. 2010, p. 165.

¹⁵² Dennis Kux, ‘India's Fine Balance’, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 3, May-June 2002, p. 94.

¹⁵³ Stephen P. Cohen and Sunil Dasgupta, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

¹⁵⁴ Madan Lal Goel, ‘Indo-American Relations in a New Light’, *Speech Delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Indian Association of American Studies* in 1999.

¹⁵⁵ Hafeez Malik, *US Relations with Afghanistan and Pakistan: The Imperial Dimension*, Oxford University Press, Karachi, p. 161.

qualitatively new and fresh relationship between the United States and India'.¹⁵⁶ Clinton's historic visit to India greatly increased Indo-US economic and military cooperation and paved the way for the Bush Administration to continue this framework of strategic relations.¹⁵⁷

After assuming office, President George W. Bush expressed his interest in continuing the rapprochement developed by his predecessor with India, which India itself eagerly reciprocated. During Jaswant Singh's visit in Washington in April 2001, President Bush unveiled his nuclear missile defence proposals, and India responded to the proposals more positively than many American allies

To sum up, New Delhi and Washington abandoned some of their past dogmatic and moralistic principles in favour of a new pragmatism during the transformative decade of 1991-2001. The end of the Cold War made Pakistan less important, less useful, and less functional for the United States, which eventually helped to pave the way for a real improvement in Indo-US relations. Not only that, India's commitment to democracy since its independence made relations between the US and India much easier and probably more sustainable than relations with Pakistan.¹⁵⁸

2.7 Realism and Shifts of India's Policy in Post-Cold War Period

As we have seen, the end of the Cold War created a new framework for international affairs. This changed scenario made Indian leaders, along with the leaders of many other countries, reassess their foreign policy. In the non-aligned years Indian policy had cultivated a moral tone in which ideals, as manifest in detachment from the agenda of either superpower, were claimed as the drivers of policy. We have shown that the claimed idealism was not always paramount and India played a classic game of maximising its influence by playing the superpowers off against each other but tending to gravitate more to the USSR than the US. 1991 changed all that and made Indian leaders recognise that in a world with only a single superpower its national interest dictated better relations with the US. This recognition was pragmatic, based on an

¹⁵⁶ 'India-US Relations: Vision for the 21st Century', www.indiaembassy.org/inews/2000.inews/september-2000.pdf

¹⁵⁷ Muhammad Ishaque Fani, 'The Indo-US Strategic Partnership in the Post 9/11: Implications for Pakistan', *Pakistan Vision*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 2009, p. 134.

¹⁵⁸ Michael Cox, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

appreciation of where power lay in the post-Cold War world rather than on a strong correspondence of US and Indian ideals and values.

Domestic economic imperatives created a congenial environment for India to become closer to the United States. Economic liberalisation and the introduction of market orientation to what had been a more mixed economy was necessary for domestic prosperity which in turn would underpin India's capacity to take on a role in world and regional affairs that was commensurate with its potential. Economic reform led to the United States the biggest investor and the largest trading partner with India and on that basis increased security cooperation, particularly on maritime issues became possible.

¹⁵⁹ India's potential role as a regional hegemonic power was a further basis for cooperation in this period, as it was consistent with a more widespread American tendency to seek client states who could maintain a form of regional stability consistent with a US led world order. India was the only candidate for such a role in South Asia and sought to adopt a stronger regional profile. There was therefore mutual interest in closer relations as a building bloc in a new world order. Beyond this India's 'Look East' promised to extend India's influence with East Asia in which the US had major concerns about stability.¹⁶⁰ From a US perspective the division in policy terms between East and South Asia was becoming anachronistic and India could have constructive influence across the Indo-Pacific.

In sum, where during the Cold war India had pursued a mixture of idealist and power politics, after that era pragmatism took precedence as ideological competition declined. The Indian response was neo-realist rather than realist because it was driven by changes in the international system still dominated by nation states rather than by existential threats. These changes brought a new clarity of purpose to Indian policy that was matched by US recognition in the early post-Cold war years of the potential of India as a partner in advancing its national interest. This did not and could not, under neo-realist assumptions, eliminate the potential for competitions and policy divergence in some areas, but it did give a structural basis to the partnership that was stronger than what went before.

¹⁵⁹ K. V. Kesavan, 'India and Community Building in Asia: From Idealism to Realism', *Ritsumeikan Annual Review of International Studies*, 2005, Vol.4, p. 16.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 19, 21.

2.8 Conclusion

With the historical background of Indo-US relations stretching over five decades, it is clear that India has always played a vital and decisive role in the formation of American policy in South Asia because of its geographical location, vast size, huge population, large market potential and increased global presence. Although, due to Cold War politics, New Delhi remained close to Moscow throughout the entire period of the Cold War, it has remained a desired ally of the United States, which sought a relationship sometimes openly and sometimes covertly.¹⁶¹

In retrospect, the first half century of Indo-US relations was disappointing. The conflict of interests that began during World War II, when India and America differed on basic priorities, continued through the more than forty years of Cold War. India and the United States found themselves on opposite sides of major foreign and security policy issues despite their common adherence to a democratic political system. To explain this differences and capacity for conflict between the two democracies, an Indian analyst remarked in late 1980s, borrowing ideas from George Bernard Shaw, that if the UK and the USA are separated despite a common language, then India and the USA are separated despite a common political system.¹⁶²

US interests and actions in South Asia have fluctuated over time and across events. At times, the US stood by India and at other times against India, depending on the particular situation in the ground and global power dynamics. When there was conflict between India and Pakistan, the US supported Pakistan against India and when the question was between India and China, the US favoured India. Given the circumstances, 45 years of Indo-US relations have been mostly uneven, often hostile, and sometimes friendly.¹⁶³

The Indian policy of non-alignment under Nehru annoyed the United States due to its contradiction with the American policy of containing the Soviet threat. Until the mid-1960s, the US perceived India as a democratic alternative to Communist China. Since

¹⁶¹ M. Raziullah Azmi, 'Pakistan-United States Relations: An Appraisal' in Ali Meherunnisa (ed.), *Reading in Pakistan's Foreign Policy 1971-1998*, Oxford University Press, Karachi, p. 237

¹⁶² Rahul Sagar, 'What's in a Name? India and America in the Twenty-First Century', *Survival*, Vol. 46, No. 3, Autumn 2004, p. 126.

¹⁶³ Dennis Kux, *op. cit.*, p. 447.

then, they have shared some important security interests, though in a passive fashion. They have had little in common but their democratic political system.

The 1965 and 1971 Indo-Pakistani wars did not facilitate Indo-US relations, and their relations reached a low point. During the entire period of the Cold War, the United States always sought help from Pakistan, as India tilted toward the USSR. US relations with India improved a little in the late 1980s under President Reagan, and this upward trend in relations continued under George H. W. Bush and Clinton, when the two countries engaged in a dialogue to redefine their strategic partnership.¹⁶⁴

In short, through various ups and downs, the Indo-US relationship reached a new stage at the beginning of the present century. It was shaped by events that took place in the final years of the 20th century. After the frostiness of the Cold War, and despite continuing tensions over the nuclear issue, the impact of the Soviet Union's collapse, reforms within India, and globalisation, the 1990s laid the groundwork for an improved strategic relationship between India and the US.

At the beginning of the Bush administration the relationship had been on an upward curve for a decade. The shock of 9/11 brought upheaval to international affairs. Whether the immediate effect of this upheaval would govern the relationship or other factors would be more important, whether, in other words, the post 9/11 world would see further closeness or reverse the trend and drive the two countries apart under the Bush administration is the subject of the next two chapters.

¹⁶⁴Madan Lal Goel, *op. cit.*

CHAPTER – THREE

Conceptual Thinking of the Bush Administration's Foreign Policy in the Wake of 9/11

3.1 Introduction

George W. Bush assumed the presidency in 2001 with no notable foreign policy experience. He said that he was not going to aim to instigate regime changes, but rather would follow his father's policy of designing a more careful foreign policy that could inspire respect from the rest of the world. He emphasized that the US would not become an arrogant nation. He further said: 'I don't want to be the world's policeman, I want to be the world's peacemaker'.¹ During his campaign he was critical of Clinton's foreign policy despite having very little knowledge of foreign policy of his own,² and insisted on a restrained foreign policy, opposing the so-called notion of nation-building. The most important foreign policy initiative of President Bush was the creation of the 'missile shield'³ over parts of Europe, as a precaution in the event that North Korea or Iran should use their nuclear missiles.⁴ President Bush along with his entire team, including his Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defence, and National Security Adviser, all agreed to avoid the overly ambitious ideas of humanitarian interventions and nation-building pursued by Bill Clinton, in what could be known as a 'reluctant sheriff' attitude. The United States was no longer in the business of global leadership as they perceived that most states in the world were capable of taking care of themselves, as the US was now taking care of itself. This was the policy pursued by the

¹The First Gore-Bush Presidential Debate, Commission on Presidential Debate, October 3, 2000, available at <http://www.debates.org/index.php?page=october-3-2000-transcript> accessed on 28 February 2016.

² Michael Rubin, 'Rogue Policy: Bush and Iran', in David B. MacDonald, Dirk Nabers and Robert G. Patman (Ed.), *The Bush Leadership, the Power of Ideas, and the War on Terror*, Ashgate, England, 2012, p. 124.

³Robin Wright in his article in *Washington Post* wrote that on 11 September 2001, national security adviser Dr. Rice was to give a speech focusing on missile defense which was never published as it was not delivered due to the trauma of the day. He quoted former US officials who have seen the text that her drafted speech was mainly on missile defence, and contained no mention of terrorism from Islamic radicals, Al-Qaeda or even Bin Laden. For details see his article 'Top Focus Before 9/11 Wasn't on Terrorism', available at <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/2004/04/01/top-focus-before-911-wasnt-on-terrorism/a8def448-9549-4fde-913d-b69a2dd2bf25/>

⁴Steve Jones, *US Foreign Policy After 9/11: Obvious Changes, Subtle Similarities*, available at <http://usforeignpolicy.about.com/od/defense/a/Us-Foreign-Policy-After-9-11.htm> accessed on 20 September 2015.

Bush Administration in its first eight months.⁵ But 9/11 caused everybody within the Administration to change their tone.

It is pertinent to mention here that President Bush's campaign advisers constituted his foreign policy team when he came to office. The majority of his team, including Wolfowitz, Perle, were part of a conservative foreign policy bloc known for their neo-conservatism. 9/11 was undoubtedly a defining moment in US history, altering the direction of US foreign policy and allowing neo-conservatives to promote their views.⁶ Two critical aspects of their world view, later incorporated into the so-called Bush Doctrine, included waging preventive war and international democratization.⁷

From the beginning, the Bush Administration was perceived as being highly religious. Although throughout history many US presidents have used religious rhetoric to gain support and unite people, particularly during national crises, President Bush was criticised on ground that his religious rhetoric was more pronounced and more political. He routinely used theological principles with references from the Bible. In his foreign policy speeches he used religious terms such 'calling' or 'mission' that has come from the 'Maker of Heaven' and 'Author of Liberty'. He said the United States had a mission from God to transform the world and it represented good over evil.⁸ He used more religious rhetoric in his foreign policy speeches after the 9/11 attacks. President Bush's automatic response to 9/11 was to launch a crusade, but he immediately corrected himself to avoid unnecessary tension with the Islamic world, and argued that the terrorists had to be defeated by the United States.⁹

Until September 11, the Bush Administration showed minimum interest in the Middle East but after the incident the region became a central focus in the US foreign policy agenda.¹⁰ Before the attack, Iraq and Saddam Hussein were regarded as a problem but

⁵Robert Kagan, 'The September 12 Paradigm: America, the World, and George W Bush', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 87, No. 5, 2008, pp. 28-9.

⁶Caroline Kennedy-Pipe, 'American Foreign Policy after 9/11' in Michael Cox and Doug Stokes (Eds.), *US Foreign Policy*, Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 404, 407.

⁷Brandon C. Prins and Allan Wilford, 'US Leadership in Post 9/11 World: Comparing World Views and Foreign Policy Decisions of George W. Bush and Barack Obama', *Policy Brief*, 1:14, Fall 2013, The Howard H. Baker Centre for Public Policy, p. 4.

⁸John B. Judis, The Chosen Nation: The Influence of Religion on U.S. Foreign Policy, *Policy Brief* 37, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, March 2005, p.1.

⁹Amy E. Black, 'With God on Our Side: Religion in George W. Bush's Foreign Policy Speeches', paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association; Chicago, Illinois, September 2-5, 2004, pp. 2, 10.

¹⁰Timothy J. Lynch and Robert S. Singh, *After Bush*, Cambridge University Press, 2008, p. 196.

not an immediate threat to the US or to world peace. Saddam's WMDs were considered a threat to the Shia and Kurds, and to threaten neighbouring countries as Iraq tried to establish itself as the dominant power in the region.¹¹ Although 9/11 was responsible for a great change in US foreign policy, many of the policy changes adopted after 9/11 were preconceived in neo-conservative's¹² minds. Toppling Saddam Hussein is the best example of this. The neo-cons wanted Saddam removed from power after the first Gulf War, and were unhappy that Saddam had not been removed. Even in January 1998, they wrote a letter to Clinton calling for Saddam's removal.¹³ So they were, in effect, in an undeclared state of war with Saddam since the 1990s. The neo-cons therefore opened the door to the Iraq invasion, even though there was no evidence to connect Saddam and 9/11.

To the neo-cons, the United States invited the attacks by being too tolerant and open. Since the attack challenged the US, so it became essential for the US to show its strength in facing Islamist evils.¹⁴ Bush responded that 'the United States can no longer solely rely on a reactive posture as we have in the past... We cannot let our enemies strike first'.¹⁵ President Bush not only followed up the 9/11 attacks by invading Afghanistan and Iraq, but also made fundamental changes in his foreign policy orientation. The thrust of this chapter is to show what changes his administration made in its relations with other countries, especially with India.

¹¹ John Newhouse, *Imperial America: The Bush Assault on the World Order*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2003, pp. 6-7.

¹² The neo-conservative movement had its origins in the 1960s. Neo-conservatism grew out of the disaffection of former liberals with aspects of both domestic and foreign policy and moved from supporting the Democratic Party to join the Republicans. On foreign policy they wanted the US to adopt more assertive stance, not being afraid to use military power to promote national interest or to assert confidently the superiority of American notions of freedom and liberty against what they perceived as communist tyranny. Some neo-conservatives occupied influential positions in Republican administrations from the 1970s but they enjoyed their greatest influence in the administration of George W. Bush where leading figures such as Vice-President Cheney and Defence Secretary Rumsfeld, though not neo-conservatives themselves, relied heavily for advice on those who were. Figures such as Richard Perle and Paul Wolfowitz saw the US as enjoying in a uniquely favourable moment in international affairs and one that it should not be afraid to use to promote its interests and ideology across the world. More cautious voices were in the ascendancy at the start of the administration but 9/11 changed the calculus and favoured the neo conservative view.

¹³ Steve Jones, *The Bush Doctrine: A Combination of Unilateralism and Preventive Warfare*, available at <http://usforeignpolicy.about.com/od/defense/a/The-Bush-Doctrine.htm> accessed on 20 September 2015.

¹⁴ David B. MacDonald, 'Historical Analogies and Leadership in Bush Administration Foreign Policy' in David B. MacDonald, Dirk Nabers and Robert G. Patman (Ed.), *The Bush Leadership, the Power of Ideas, and the War on Terror*, Ashgate, England, 2012, p. 43.

¹⁵ Ivo H. Daalder and James M. Lindsay, *America Unbound: The Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, 2003, p. 14.

3.2 Bush's Foreign Policy until the Events of September 11

As stated in the introduction, President Bush himself had no foreign policy experience, and less interest in foreign affairs than in domestic issues. He was largely guided by his foreign policy advisory team, which played an enormous role in foreign affairs.¹⁶ Initially, national affairs occupied his presidency, but it was inevitable that foreign affairs should become more dominant.

President Bush's foreign policy advisors were extremely critical of Clinton's policies and rejected many of his policies and legacies. This attitude was given a name: 'Anything But Clinton – ABC'.¹⁷ National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice wrote that Clinton's humanitarian interventionism had overtaken US national interest, and she blamed the Clinton Administration for over using and under resourcing the US armed forces and for sending forces abroad on missions that jeopardised the national interest of the United States.¹⁸ The Bush Administration regarded Clinton's foreign policy approach as immature.

Until 9/11, the main focus of the Bush Administration was to give special attention to China, overlooking Russia in the process. Pakistan was subordinated to India, and Afghanistan and East Africa were out of agenda.¹⁹ Low priority was given to the Middle East, but there were some discussions on how to deal with rogue states like Iraq, Iran, and North Korea.²⁰ There was an attempt to minimise US multilateral obligations and to push for the development of an antimissile defence system to counter rogue states.

During the initial eight months of the Bush Administration, Bush did not introduce any new initiatives in foreign policy. Neither the president himself, nor any of his advisors, talked about the spreading of democracy outside the US.²¹ There was no substantial discussion or debate on US grand strategy for the new century. Though President Bush was committed to pursuing a humble foreign policy, it subsequently became clear that

¹⁶ Christopher D. O'Sullivan, *Collin Powell: A political Biography*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Maryland, 2009, p. 129.

¹⁷ John Dumbrell, *Clinton's Foreign Policy: Between the Bushes, 1992-2000*, Routledge, 2009, p. 171.

¹⁸ Robert G. Patman, 'Globalization, the Post-Cold War Era, and Visions of US Leadership' in David B. MacDonald, Dirk Nabers and Robert G. Patman (Ed.), *The Bush Leadership, the Power of Ideas, and the War on Terror*, Ashgate, England, 2012, p. 28.

¹⁹ Walter Lafeber, 'The Bush Doctrine', *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 26, No. 4, Fall 2002, p. 546.

²⁰ Melvyn P. Leffler, '9/11 Retrospect: George W. Bush's Grand Strategy, Reconsidered', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 90, No. 5, (September/October), 2011, pp. 33-34.

²¹ Mackubin Thomas Owens, 'The Bush Doctrine: The Foreign Policy of Republican Empire', *ORBIS*, Winter 2009, p. 24.

under this disguise, there was a pre-occupation with a neo-con agenda, irrespective of whether it was appropriate for the situation or not. This agenda stemmed from the intellectual roots of the neo-cons in the 'Project for the New American Century'. Top of their agenda was to fight Iraq, where they had an undisclosed intention to invade and topple Saddam, though the situation was not an immediate priority, as Iraq seemed under control.²²

The Bush Administration did not consider terrorism a major priority before September 11. In fact, Clinton's second administration placed a far greater focus on Al Qaeda than the Bush Administration did before 9/11.²³ The 9/11 Commission Report mentioned a meeting in December 2000 between President Clinton and then President-Elect George W. Bush, in which Clinton had said to Bush: 'I think you will find that by far your biggest threat is Bin Laden and Al Qaeda'. Bush response was that 'he felt sure President Clinton had mentioned terrorism, but did not remember much being said about Al Qaeda'.²⁴ Not only that, US intelligence also informed the Bush Administration about the possible threat of terror attacks on American soil that Al Qaeda was preparing to strike, which would be a catastrophe and might result in huge casualties. The Administration did not dismiss this possibility out of hand, but despite, their prior knowledge of the possibility of attacks, they failed to take any adequate safeguards, something that was acknowledged by Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz with great remorse. Responding to the attack, Condoleezza Rice said: '9/11 crystallized our vulnerability' and Colin Powell said 'A new reality was born'.²⁵

Although the Bush Administration was not seriously concerned about terrorism and possible terror attacks on US soil, the attacks changed US policy significantly and dramatically. The incident provided the Bush Administration with a great opportunity to materialise its pre-developed neo-con agenda. The entire world stood with the leadership; even Tehran expressed its readiness to extend assistance.²⁶ But, as stated above, the neo-cons had been intent on toppling Saddam since early 1990s and

²² Andrea K. Riemer, U.S. foreign policy from Bush to Bush: Enduring parameters and policy options Part 3: The Bush43 presidencies – Policy options, *AARMS Security*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 2008, pp. 118, 121.

²³ John Dumbrell, *Clinton's Foreign Policy: Between the Bushes, 1992-2000*, Routledge, 2009, p. 170.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

²⁵ Melvyn P. Leffler, '9/11 and the Past and Future of American Foreign Policy', *International Affairs*, Vol. 79, No. 5, 2003, p. 1048.

²⁶ Christopher D. O'Sullivan, *op.cit.*, pp. 152-3.

9/11 gave them the opportunity to pursue that goal even as it risked alienating much of the support from other nations that the US had received in the aftermath of the attack.

3.3 Basic Principles of Bush Foreign Policy – Enunciation of a New National Security Strategy

Undoubtedly, 9/11 created a paradigm shift, which essentially changed the nature of the international system.²⁷ This single horrendous incident forced the US to reorient and reformulate its policies to the rest of the world. As noted above, the Bush Administration took advantage and exploited this terrorist attack to promote its pre-conceived neo-con agenda. President Bush responded to the attacks with the declaration of a War on Terror and later the enunciation of a 'New National Security Strategy' in 2002 that came to be known as the Bush Doctrine.

On 29 January 2002, President Bush in his first State of the Union address elaborated on the Bush Doctrine, which he did further in his book *Decision Points*. There were three main elements in the Doctrine. First, the United States will make no distinction between the terrorists and the countries that indulge them, and would aim to bring them to justice. Second, the US would challenge any threats before they fully materialise and would take pre-emptive action against adversaries before they attack the US. Finally, the US will face the enemy's ideology of repression and fear, by advancing liberty and hope.²⁸ President Bush said those who harbour the terrorists and seek WMDs were the real danger to the peace and security of the world, and he called them the 'axis of evil'. He also said that the war in Afghanistan was just the beginning of the War on Terror.²⁹ There were many other elements in the Bush Doctrine but three of them made it significant to Asia: the axis of evil (isolating Iran, Iraq, and North Korea), pre-emptive strikes, and the US approach of balancing bilateral and multilateral security in the regional order.³⁰

The Bush Doctrine became the cardinal principle of US foreign policy from the moment of its declaration. It redefined US relations with countries around the world. It helped in

²⁷ John Lewis Gaddis, *Surprise, Security and the American Experience*, Harvard University Press, 2002, Boston, p. 77.

²⁸ George W. Bush, *Decision Points*, Virgin Books, 2010, pp. 396-7.

²⁹ George W. Bush, *State of the Union Address*, January 29, 2002, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/gwbush/speeches/speech-4540> accessed 25 September 2015.

³⁰ Amitav Acharya, 'The Bush Doctrine and Asian Regional Order: The Perils and Pitfalls of Preemption', *Asian Perspective*, Vol. 27, No. 4, 2003, p. 219.

reviving and strengthening US relations with major countries, including Russia, China, and India, as each of these states faced terrorism and insurgency.³¹

After the attacks, President Bush's message to the world was: 'Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. Either you stand with civilization and good [us], or with barbarism and evil [them]. And to those nations that choose wrongly, beware'.³² Such an approach left no space for honest disagreement.³³

Whereas Europe displayed a rather lukewarm reaction to this approach, China opposed it, as, in their perception this strategic plan was oriented to preventing Chinese military growth. Interestingly, however, India was very much more supportive of the Bush Doctrine, for which a number of explanations are possible. These include India wanting the US to lift the sanctions imposed on it after the nuclear test in 1998, its desire for US support for securing a permanent seat on the UN Security Council, its desire to increase economic ties with the US, and, most importantly, its desire to replace Pakistan as an American strategic partner in the region.³⁴

3.3.1 The Policy of Pre-emption

The essential part of the Bush Doctrine was pre-emptive action to deter another potential attack on the US, and this ultimately became the basis of Bush's foreign policy after 9/11. It was argued that the New Strategy of the Bush Doctrine was the outcome of the hawkish minds of the neo-cons (such as Paul Wolfowitz) who had been professing ideas of US military hegemony, unilateralism, and pre-emption since the early 1990s.³⁵ President Bush promised to fight the axis of evil before they could take action against the US. He said: 'We'll be deliberate, yet time is not on our side. I will not wait on events while dangers gather. I will not stand by as peril draws closer and closer. The United States of America will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons'.³⁶ The Iraq invasion in 2003 by

³¹Michael Hirsh, Bush and the World, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 5 (September-October), 2002, p. 19.

³²*Ibid.*

³³Christopher D. O'Sullivan, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

³⁴Roger Cohen, 'What the World Wants from America', *The New York Times*, 11 January 2005.

³⁵Melvyn Leffler cited in his article that a number of articles have been written not only in US but in Britain and Europe also arguing the same. See Melvyn P. Leffler, '9/11 and the Past and Future of American Foreign Policy', *International Affairs*, Vol. 79, No. 5, Oct., 2003, p. 1045.

³⁶George W. Bush, *State of the Union Address*, January 29, 2002, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/gwbush/speeches/speech-4540> accessed 25 September 2015.

the Bush Administration was the best example of this policy of pre-emption.³⁷ Although during the presidential campaign and even after assuming power, President Bush pledged to use military power only to abolish potential threats to the US, the Bush Doctrine reformulated his foreign policy to allow him to use pre-emptive armed force against US enemies, and to remove leaders and networks who threatened the US.³⁸

The idea of pre-emptive action was not introduced for the first time by the Bush Administration. It has existed from the ancient period³⁹ and is recognized as a reality of international security. In the early 1960s, this policy was vital to Kennedy's Administration in managing the Cuban Missile Crisis. President Reagan's pre-emptive action in Grenada was another example of this policy. And even in 1994, President Clinton was ready to attack North Korea pre-emptively. So the essence of the Bush Doctrine was that the US would remain ready to act pre-emptively as needed against those who harbour terrorists and pursue WMDs.⁴⁰

There is an obvious distinction between pre-emption and aggression. President Bush said: 'The United States will not use force in all cases to pre-empt emerging threats, nor should nations use pre-emption as a pretext for aggression'.⁴¹ Pre-emption indicates that the potential or emerging threat could be treated as legitimate grounds for using force against those who posed it. Hence this policy of pre-emption pursued in fighting terrorism significantly expands the definition of self-defence and the grounds on which the state has the right to use force when confronted by potential threats.⁴²

3.3.2 American Unilateralism

US foreign policy under the Bush Administration has been characterised as unilateralist – an essential element of the Bush Doctrine. It contains an element of American

³⁷ Jeffery W. Knopf, 'Wrestling with Deterrence: Bush Administration Strategy after 9/11', *Contemporary Security Policy*, Vol. 29, No. 2, August 2008, p. 229.

³⁸ Patricia, L. Dunmire, '9/11 Changed Everything': An Intertextual Analysis of the Bush Doctrine', *Discourse & Society*, Vol. 20., No. 2., p. 196.

³⁹ The Peloponnesian War of the ancient Greek period between Sparta and Athens was the best example of pre-emptive war in the ancient period, where Sparta concluded that it had to act before being overwhelmed by the rising power and ambition of Athens.

⁴⁰ Antony Anghie and Charles Hill, 'The Bush Administration Preemption Doctrine and the United Nations', *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting* (American Society of International Law), Vol. 98, March-April, 2004, p. 329.

⁴¹ President Bush, 'US National Security Strategy: Prevent Our Enemies From Threatening Us, Our Allies, and Our Friends with Weapons of Mass Destruction', New York, June 1, 2002, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ei/wh/15425.htm>, accessed 8 March 2016.

⁴² Antony Anghie and Charles Hill, 'The Bush Administration Preemption Doctrine and the United Nations', p. 326.

exceptionalism, and the desire to avoid the entanglement of international institutions. This approach of unilateralism was exposed even before of September 11, as evidenced by the US withdrawal (along with Australia) from the Kyoto Protocol in March 2001.⁴³

US unilateralism essentially means that the US will first announce its decision to act in a particular situation, and then expect other countries to support and join US under its terms and conditions. President Bush favoured unilateralism, which was a clear distinction from his predecessors. When George Bush announced the 'coalition of the willing' on the War on Terror and the intention to remove Saddam, many American allies did not join this coalition.⁴⁴ Leadership requires not only the power to destroy but the ability to persuade; President Bush failed to observe this distinction. Instead of following the standard actions of strategic diplomacy he wanted to reorder the world through his policy of unilateralism.⁴⁵

Multilateralism in Bush's view was a process directed toward convincing people that the US president was not going to execute decisions alone, violating the common wisdom of the global community. To implement the US decision to invade Iraq, President Bush emphasised the importance of increasing the number of countries that supported his decision, no matter whether the country was large, tiny, strong, near, far or even able to make any noticeable contribution. Attacking the Taliban in Afghanistan brought huge support worldwide and Bush accepted troop contributions from twenty states.⁴⁶ Nevertheless Bush's so-called multilateralism post-9/11 refers to a means or process only.⁴⁷ And it was in clear disregard of multilateralism in a true sense. The rejection of the Kyoto Protocol, opposition to the ICC, and abrogation of the ABM Treaty were other examples of this.

The United States was expecting India like many other countries to join its pre-emptive initiative in the wake of the Iraq invasion in April 2003. Jaswant Singh, External Affairs Minister of India, declared in the Indian Parliament that 'India had a much better case to

⁴³ Steve Jones, The Bush Doctrine: A Combination of Unilateralism and Preventive Warfare, available at <http://usforeignpolicy.about.com/od/defense/a/The-Bush-Doctrine.htm> accessed on 20 September 2015.

⁴⁴ Tej Pratap Singh, 'China Factor in the Growing US-India Strategic Partnership', Study' in Amulya K. Tripathy (Ed.), *Post 9/11 United States-India Relations: Towards an Active Engagement*, Reference Press, New Delhi, 2013, pp. 174-75.

⁴⁵ Bill Richardson, 'New Realism: A Realistic and Principled Foreign Policy', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 87, No. 1 (Jan. - Feb.), 2008, p. 145.

⁴⁶ Ivo H. Daalder and James M. Lindsay, *op.cit.*, p. 116.

⁴⁷ Simon S.C. Tay, 'Asia and the United States after 9/11: Primacy and Partnership in the Pacific', *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*, Vol. 28, No. 1, Winter, 2004, p. 117.

go for pre-emptive action against Pakistan than the US has in Iraq'. But New Delhi later toned down its stance on the pre-emption policy.⁴⁸

3.3.3 The War on Terror

The Bush Administration was committed not to engage in humanitarian intervention and avoid the idea of nation-building and democracy promotion, but just nine days after the 9/11 incident, President Bush shifted the orientation of US foreign policy, making the War on Terror his main focus and committing to fight to the end with all the US's resources. He said in an address to a joint session of Congress: 'We will direct every resource at our command – every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war – to the destruction and to the defeat of the global terror network'.⁴⁹ Terrorism therefore ranked at the top of the US foreign policy agenda in the post-9/11 period.⁵⁰

The terminology of the War on Terror was not a fresh one conceived of by George W. Bush; he merely revived it in the aftermath of 9/11. The terminology was first used by anarchists to assassinate political leaders in the 19th century. Later in the 1940s, Great Britain used it in their colonial campaigns, and President Reagan similarly used it during the 1980s.⁵¹ The phrase has been used to fight Al Qaeda since September 11, but President Bush maintained that 'Our war on terror begins with Al Qaeda, but it does not end there'.⁵²

The phrase was a label utilised by the Bush Administration, but promoted by the influential neo-cons in the administration. This slogan provided the opportunity to materialise and justify their decade-old policy of pre-emptive war, first in Afghanistan and ultimately in laying the foundation for the invasion of Iraq.⁵³

⁴⁸ Amitav Acharya, *op. cit.*, pp. 224, 235-237.

⁴⁹ President Bush's address to a joint session of Congress on Thursday night, September 20, 2001, available at <http://edition.cnn.com/2001/US/09/20/gen.bush.transcript/> accessed 29 September 2015.

⁵⁰ Interview with Ambassador Anthony Quainton in Washington DC, 4 December 2012.

⁵¹ Caroline Kennedy-Pipe, 'American Foreign Policy after 9/11' in Michael Cox and Doug Stokes (Eds.), *US Foreign Policy*, Oxford University Press, 2008, p. 406.

⁵² President Bush's address to a joint session of Congress on Thursday night, September 20, 2001, available at <http://edition.cnn.com/2001/US/09/20/gen.bush.transcript/> accessed 29 September 2015.

⁵³ Stephen D. Reese and Seth C. Lewis, 'Framing the War on Terror: The Internalization of Policy in the US Press', *Journalism*, Vol. 10, No. 6, 2009, pp.777-9.

The Bush Administration regarded terrorism as the ‘mother of all threats’⁵⁴ and it further declared that modern terrorists are ‘the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the 20th century’⁵⁵, omnipresent in the world and always prepared to attack our civilization. So it was not a surprise that as a consequence of the 9/11 attacks ‘everything has changed’ in US policy if not in the whole world.⁵⁶ Finally the phrase could be described as a continuous effort at reimagining the security of the US and the international community by the Bush Administration. President Bush’s idea of waging the War on Terror unified US domestic opinion, bridging the differences between the Democrats and Republicans for a considerable period, and also received support and sympathy from the international community until the Iraq invasion.⁵⁷

3.4 9/11 and the US Policy Focus on South Asia

There can be no denying that the September 11 attacks shook the South Asian landscape. In an interview with Professor Stephen P. Cohen conducted for this thesis, he said no part of the globe was affected by 9/11 as much as South Asia.⁵⁸ The Bush Administration declaration that ‘everything has changed’ certainly had a great influence on the region. Before 9/11, the US global strategic priority was to face the ‘China threat’, but in response to 9/11, priority shifted to the war against global terrorism and South Asia became a focal point of US foreign policy. As the events had rapidly altered the global security environment, President Bush said: ‘All of this was brought upon us in a single day, and night fell on a different world, a world where freedom itself is under attack’.⁵⁹ The events made South Asia the first and primary theatre of US policy on the War on Terror, causing the US to revive and redefine its relations with countries in the region. The War on Terror facilitated the US military presence in Afghanistan, Pakistan,

⁵⁴ Dirk Nabers, ‘Identity Construction in US Foreign Policy during the Bush Years’ in David B. MacDonald, Dirk Nabers and Robert G. Patman (Ed.), *The Bush Leadership, the Power of Ideas, and the War on Terror*, p. 63.

⁵⁵ George W. Bush, ‘Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People’, *The White House*, 20 September 2001, available at <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>, accessed 8 March 2016.

⁵⁶ Dirk Nabers, *op.cit.*, p. 55.

⁵⁷ Simon S.C. Tay, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

⁵⁸ Interview with Stephen P. Cohen in Washington DC, December 7, 2012.

⁵⁹ President Bush’s address to a joint session of Congress on Thursday night, September 20, 2001, available at <http://edition.cnn.com/2001/US/09/20/gen.bush.transcript/> accessed 29 September 2015.

and even neighbouring central Asian countries for the first time. US ties with India were also facilitated by the war, especially in military-to-military relations.⁶⁰

Although India provided unconditional support to the US global war against terrorism immediately, it could not offer what Pakistan had⁶¹, and this disparity led to the revival Cold War mentality. The United States treated Pakistan as a frontline state facing Afghanistan and the Taliban, as it had faced Russians during the Cold War. Pakistan steadily re-emerged as a key regional player, because the situation again made it a vital ally to the US. One indication of this renewed importance was that Pakistan was given the status of a non-NATO ally.⁶² Over time this situation changed, however, and Pakistan gradually lost ground as India gained increased importance in US eyes. I will delineate below how far US policy changed in the region and what the main factors behind this were.

3.4.1 Recognising India as a Natural Ally, and the Strategic Partnership

Its democratic political system, freedom of speech, liberty, tolerance, multi-culturalism, multi-religiosity, and freedom of press made India eligible to be a natural ally to US. The mightiest and most populous democracies in the world had not been close for at least five decades. President Clinton took India seriously and President Bush continued Clinton's policy, and thus relations between the US and India improved significantly.⁶³

After Bush's election victory, there had been a lot of speculation about US relations with India, and particularly about whether the US relationship with India would continue the upward trend that was begun during Clinton term. The sky became clear after early speeches by the President and Secretary of State. The policy adopted by the administration toward the region until 9/11 suggested an obvious tilt toward India and the downgrading of US traditional links with Pakistan.⁶⁴ From the beginning, the Bush Administration recognised India's rise and pre-eminence in South Asia, and President

⁶⁰ Poly Nayak, 'US Security Policy on South Asia Since 9/11 — Challenges and Implications for the Future', *Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies*, Occasional Paper Series, February 2005, p. 2.

⁶¹ Pakistan has 2500 kilometres long border with Afghanistan and long-time close relations with the Taliban.

⁶² Chou, David S., 'US Policy Toward India and Pakistan in the Post-Cold War Era', in Chou, David S., *US Policy Toward South Asia in the Post-Cold War Era*, Sheng-Chih Book Co. Ltd, 2003, p. 47.

⁶³ Harald Müller and Andreas Schmidt, 'Natural Friends'? Relations between the United States and India after 2001, *Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF) Reports*, No. 87, 2009, p. 25

⁶⁴ Muhammad Munir, Muhammad Ahsan, 'US Strategic Policy towards India and Pakistan in Post 9/11', *Turkish Yearbook*, Vol. XXXIX, p.148.

Bush stated in the meeting of the Republican National Committee that the US should engage with India as the most populous democracy of the world.⁶⁵

Secretary Powell told a Senate panel: 'India has to be a high priority for foreign policy activities of the US'⁶⁶, which made clear the US intention to bring its relations with India onto a higher plane. Thus, it granted India a more vital role in American foreign policy in Asia, which was reflected in the 'new global strategy framework' of May 2001.⁶⁷ At that time, when Richard Armitage, Deputy Secretary of State, went to India to seek Indian support for President Bush's ideas on a new strategic framework for international security, India responded positively. General Powell made some other very important statements: '...India has the potential to keep the peace in the vast Indian Ocean area and its periphery. We need to work harder and more consistently to assist India in this endeavour, while not neglecting our friends in Pakistan'.⁶⁸ Therefore, the Bush Administration's interest was revealed in continuing and intensifying the rapprochement started during the final year of the Clinton Administration. Initially then Bush pursued a more proactive pattern of cooperation in developing US relations with India.

Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee mentioned in his speech to the Indian parliament, following President Clinton's speech, that the US and India 'have all the potential to become natural allies'.⁶⁹ The Bush Administration regarded India in the same way as a natural ally. President Bush called the Indo-US relationship a 'strategic partnership'.⁷⁰ A number of factors contributed to shared strategic interests; these included the nuclearisation of South Asia, the Talibanisation of the region and the rise of Islamic fundamentalism.⁷¹ In addition, Indian and the US' views on economic liberalization and

⁶⁵ Mohammed Badrul Alam, 'Analysing Indo-US Relations during Bush Presidency', *Area Studies: A Journal of International Studies and Analysis*, Vol.3, No.1, 2009, p. 66.

⁶⁶ Malini Parthasarathy, India's place in the new U.S. world view, *The Hindu* (January 30, 2001), available at <http://www.thehindu.com/thehindu/2001/01/30/stories/05302523.htm>, accessed 8 March 2016.

⁶⁷ Priyadarshini Panda, 'US-India Political Relations: A 9/11 Study' in Amulya K. Tripathy (Ed.), *Post 9/11 United States-India Relations: Towards an Active Engagement*, Reference Press, New Delhi, 2013, p. 59.

⁶⁸ Statement of Secretary of State-Designate Collin Powell, Prepared for the Confirmation of the US Senate Committee on Foreign relations, January 17, 2001, available at <http://www.gwu.edu/~action/stopen.html> accessed 2 October 2015.

⁶⁹ Strobe Talbott, *Engaging India: Diplomacy, Democracy and the Bomb*, Brookings Institution Press, 2004, p. 200.

⁷⁰ Interview with Deepa Ollapally in Washington DC,

⁷¹ Umbreen Javaid, 'Intensive US Engagement for Enhanced Role in South Asia', *South Asian Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 1, January-June 2010, p. 66.

Asian democratization were similar.⁷² As soon as President Bush declared the developing of the National Missile Defence, India became the first to support it.

President Bush was very impressed with India's genuine democratic values, and his foreign policy team considered India to be an emerging great power and a new strategic partner. They therefore sought to involve India in a variety of issues, including terrorism, trade, and military and scientific cooperation. To this end, Robert Blackwill – strategy analyst, and expert on China and nuclear proliferation – was appointed as ambassador to India. The Bush Administration also perceived that US relations with India would be very useful if relations were to go wrong with the Chinese.⁷³ While the Clinton administration considered India a source of instability in the non-proliferation issue, President Bush kept the issue on the backburner, and leaned toward incorporating India as a constructive and positive player in overall Asian security.⁷⁴

The Bush Administration emphasised three aspects in relation to India: that India should no longer be perceived as being of less value than China, but rather a counterweight against it, that the US would facilitate India's desire of attaining global status, and that India should become a strategic partner of the US. In the words of Dr. Limaye, the United States did not want to see India as standing against China, but as a rising global power in the Indian Ocean and as a regional balancer.⁷⁵ The United States not only received India's complete support for the War on Terror but found India a partner with which it could achieve its goal of 'creating a strategically stable Asia'.⁷⁶

After outlining the US perspectives and policies toward India, it is now important to discuss how India responded to US policies and reacted to the 9/11 attacks. India offered its military bases and facilities to the United States, offered intelligence on terror networks, and port facilities in Mumbai for US naval vessels. Although the US showed its gratitude, it declined and chose to use Pakistani facilities instead, which were more convenient for fighting the Taliban and Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan.⁷⁷ Accepting

⁷² Leena Thacker-Kumar and Joel R. Campbell, 'U.S. Foreign Policy In Asia Since 9/11: Temporary Alliances Or Permanent Changes?', *International Social Science Review*, Vol. 82, Nos. 3 & 4, p. 103.

⁷³ Dennis Kux, 'India's Fine Balance', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 3, May-June 2002, p. 95

⁷⁴ Wolfowitz P., The US Deputy Secretary of Defence, 'The Gathering Storm: The Threat of Global Terror and Asia Pacific Security' *The First IISS Asia Security Conference: The Shangri-La Dialogue*, Singapore, May 31-June 2002.

⁷⁵ Interview with Satu Limaye in Washington DC, 3 December 2012.

⁷⁶ Interview with Thomas Lynch in Washington DC, 5 December 2012.

⁷⁷ Patryk Kugiel, 'United States-India: Partnership of Democracies for the 21st Century', *PISM Research Papers*, Issue: 14, May 2010, p. 34.

Pakistan's military government's offer and designating it as a US main ally in the War on Terror, and giving Pakistan the status of a non-NATO ally, made Indo-US relations somewhat bitter. Terrorism brought India and the US closer together. India has been facing terrorism since its inception. Three of India's leaders died in terrorist attacks, though each case was for a different reason. Immediately before 9/11, India experienced two significant terror instances. One was the attack on the Red Fort in Delhi in December 2000, and other was the hijacking of flight 814 to Kandahar in December 1999. And few weeks after 9/11, India witnessed another terrible attack on its parliament, allegedly by terror networks based in Pakistan. Though India extended its unconditional support for the US fight against terrorism, the US failed to condemn Pakistan for its possible involvement in the attacks, a fact that annoyed India greatly. At the same time, the Bush Administration's decision to completely lift the sanctions from both India and Pakistan, annoyed India further as it disapproved of this equal treatment for (what it perceived as) unequal states.⁷⁸

In sum, while India supported the war on terror the net early effect of 9/11 was to shift US strategic considerations away from India. This went against its long term perspective of India as an emerging global and regional partner. US policy in response to 9/11 favoured largely Pakistan and saw US-India relations take a step backward but the longer term strategic significance of India gradually took precedence over the short term value of Pakistan to the US and led the Bush administration to seek to overcome the estrangement of the immediate post 9/11 period. This policy gathered force and achieved some success in the second Bush Administration.

3.4.2 The Policy of De-hyphenation: No Special Relations with Pakistan

Due to Cold War politics, US special relations with Pakistan had always been a hindrance to having better relations with India. Toward the end of his presidency, Clinton perceived that the US no longer needed a special relationship with Pakistan, and India was given greater priority. President Bush had the same perception and decided not to balance US relations with the permanent adversaries, but to follow the separate tracks on their own.⁷⁹ Colin Powell made it clear, as mentioned above, that the US should work consistently hard to help India in its endeavour to become a balancer in the

⁷⁸Harald Müller and Andreas Schmidt, *op.cit.*, pp. 3, 4, 7.

⁷⁹Dennis Kux, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

Indian Ocean region and in gaining status as a global power without neglecting the US friendship with Pakistan. Rather than supporting one country or the other, the Bush Administration followed a policy centred on ‘a decoupling of India and Pakistan in American calculations’.⁸⁰ His team decided on a path defined by what came to be known as the ‘de-hyphenation strategy’.⁸¹

The policy of de-hyphenation between India and Pakistan started under the Clinton Administration and continued under Bush. The US aspiration was to work with India as an economic partner but security relations were also important to the extent that there was a convergence of terrorism concerns. Although the understanding about this issue was far from perfect, it was sufficient for New Delhi and Washington to find a common language.⁸² The United States has one set of interests in India and with the Indian government, and a different set of interests in Pakistan and with the Pakistani government, which require distinct policies.⁸³ After 9/11, Islamic terrorism directed US foreign policy toward Pakistan, not toward India, while the rise of China directed US policy toward India, not toward Pakistan. US relations with Pakistan were therefore carried out under the auspices of the US in Afghanistan, while US relations with India were carried out under the auspices of other interests. But de-hyphenation was never able to deal with the India-Pakistan conflict itself.⁸⁴

The NSS of 2006 stated that, ‘America’s relationship with Pakistan will not be a mirror image of our relationship with India.’⁸⁵ It also said that the Indo-US relation had made substantial progress despite Washington having improved relations with Islamabad at the same time. It had been widely felt that that good relation with both countries was mutually exclusive, but the Bush Administration demonstrated that simultaneously good relation with each was possible, which could help both to achieve a lasting peace between them.⁸⁶

⁸⁰ Interview with Stephen P. Cohen in Washington DC, 7 December 2012

⁸¹ Interview with Stephen P. Cohen in Washington DC, 7 December 2012.

⁸² Interview with Thomas Lynch in Washington DC, 5 December 2012.

⁸³ Interview with Ambassador Anthony Quainton in Washington DC, 4 December 2012.

⁸⁴ Interview with Stephen P. Cohen in Washington DC, 7 December 2012.

⁸⁵ The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, March 2006, The White House, Washington.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

3.4.3 Balancing China

The post-Cold-War era witnessed a debate in the international political system between the United States, India, and China, and the post-9/11 war against global terrorism provided them with a common platform for deliberation on issues of strategic importance.⁸⁷ President Bush said: 'In this moment of opportunity, a common danger is erasing old rivalries. America is working with Russia and China and India, in ways we have never before, to achieve peace and prosperity'.⁸⁸ The rise of China posed a great challenge to India in the 21st century and, therefore, undoubtedly the China factor played an increasingly significant role in the Indo-US strategic partnership under the Bush Administration. Not only that, Japan also considered this giant economic power as a danger to South Asia, and Australia wanted to strengthen its relations with the US in response to Chinese rise in East Asia.⁸⁹ There were views amongst US analysts that the US was helping India to become a global power to act as a counterweight against China. Indian analysts differed here, arguing that India was attempting to improve its relations with China and trying to end their border dispute with the Chinese.⁹⁰ China also started to accept the reality of India's emergence as a global power, with its immense economic potential, military capacity, and strategic aspiration.⁹¹

Increasing Indo-US cooperation was not motivated only by India's own potential but by the US fear that China's rise might lead to global instability. Realist theorist John J. Mearsheimer envisaged that a rising China and the United States would be engaged in an intense security competition with huge potential for war, and that an increasingly powerful China would try to push the US military out of Asia to make itself a regional hegemon.⁹² President Bush endorsed that perception and considered China a potential challenger to the US at least in the Asia-Pacific, if not in the world, and he called China a 'strategic competitor' rather 'strategic partner' as President Clinton had done.⁹³

⁸⁷ Ananya Chatterjee, 'India-China-United States: The Post-Cold War Evolution of a Strategic Triangle', *Political Perspectives*, volume 5, No. 3, 2011, p. 74.

⁸⁸ President Bush address to the State of the Union to the 107th Congress in January 29, 2002, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/gwbush/speeches/speech-4540> accessed on 3 October 2015.

⁸⁹ Muhammad Ishaque Fani, 'The Indo-US Strategic Partnership in the Post 9/11: Implications for Pakistan', *Pakistan Vision*, Vol. 10, No. 2, p.134.

⁹⁰ Kuldip Nayar, 'India-US Treaty or Alliance'? *The Dawn*, Lahore, July 16, 2005.

⁹¹ Zhang Li, 'China-India Relations: Strategic Engagement and Challenges', *Asie Visions* 34, IFRI, Centre for Asian Studies, France, September, 2010, p.10.

⁹² Tej Pratap Singh, op. cit, pp. 164-5.

⁹³ Ananya Chatterjee, op.cit., p. 75.

Condoleezza Rice regarded China as the main strategic rival to the US, and emphasised the importance of establishing a stronger relationship with India as a counterweight to China in view of the continued Sino-Indian border dispute and the war they had fought in 1962 over Himalayan border.⁹⁴ Ashley Tellis was also of the opinion that India, with its huge potential, would not only be a partner of the US but could be a geopolitical balancer to China.⁹⁵ It was a common speculation in the triangular dynamic that an Indo-US alignment would be useful against the rise of China, but, at the same time, there has also been speculation that Sino-Indian cooperation might stand against the unipolar international system led by the United States.⁹⁶

Scholars whom I have interviewed such as Ambassador Anthony Quainton, Dr. Satu Limaye, and Professor Deepa Ollapally believed that US policy toward India was not driven by fear of China at all; rather India was treated very much on its own terms. The United States wanted India and China to succeed as they are major markets and it was in US interest to maintain security and regional order through mutual prosperity.⁹⁷ On the other hand, scholars like Ambassador Howard B. Schaffer and Stephen P. Cohen maintained that Indo-US relations were partly driven by a fear of China, but that that was not the main element. The main element was the recognition of India's rise to the status of a global power. Schaffer stated: 'I certainly and strongly agree that the rise of China has made the US more interested in India than we would have been otherwise'.⁹⁸ Stephen P. Cohen expressed his views this way:

There is a complex policy, not a single issue. Different Americans regard India for different reasons. People of different groups have got different interests in India. The military has one interest, nuclear people have another interest, and business people have another kind of interest. But they can agree on very basic policies and be supportive of India. Policy is not to contain China necessarily; this may be the Pentagon view, but the White House may have different view. There is no single voice in US. It is to balance China. To contain China will make China more hostile.⁹⁹

⁹⁴Patryk Kugiel, *op.cit.*, p. 40

⁹⁵Ashley J. Tellis, 'The Merits of De-hyphenation: Explaining U.S. Success in Engaging India and Pakistan', *The Washington Quarterly*, Autumn, 2008, p. 24.

⁹⁶Harry Harding, 'The Evolution of the Strategic Triangle: China, India and the United States', in Francine R. Frankel & Harry Harding (ed.), *The India-China Relationship: what the United States needs to know*, Columbia University Press, New York, 2004, p. 323.

⁹⁷Interview with Ambassador Anthony Quainton, Dr. Satu Limaye, Professor Deepa Ollapally in Washington DC, 4, 3, 6 (respectively) December 2012.

⁹⁸Interview with Ambassador Howard B. Schaffer in Washington DC, 5 December 2012.

⁹⁹Interview with Stephen P. Cohen in Washington DC, 7 December 2012.

India as a great democracy is a counterweight to China ideologically,¹⁰⁰ but that is not the only element or aspect of Indo-US relations.¹⁰¹

3.5 Conclusion

That 9/11 has ‘changed everything’ has become a fashionable phrase to use in recent years. No doubt due to 9/11, many things have changed but many others remain the same. 9/11 altered and reshaped many aspects of the Bush Administration’s thinking on its foreign policy.¹⁰² Prominent US scholar Noam Chomsky argued that the ‘belief that 9/11 signalled a sharp change in the course of history...seems questionable’.¹⁰³

The post-9/11 policy of the Bush Administration was largely shaped by his predecessors and President Bush even owed a debt to his father for this transformative change. His branding of the ‘axis of evil’ reflected the challenges posed by North Korea in making Northeast Asia unstable, Iran’s desire to be unchallenged in the Persian Gulf, and the unfinished campaign against Saddam in 1990s.¹⁰⁴ President Bush himself immediately described the events as the US’ new Pearl Harbour and Dr. Rice repeatedly made the same statement bringing it into greater historical context.¹⁰⁵ Although President Bush was initially determined to follow Kissinger-like ‘realpolitik’¹⁰⁶ policies, the events of 9/11 caused him to shift to an extensive ‘Wilsonianism’¹⁰⁷ influenced by neo-cons.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁰ Interview with Ambassador Anthony Quainton in Washington DC, 4 December 2012.

¹⁰¹ Interview with Thomas Farr in Washington DC, 6 December 2012.

¹⁰² Christopher Layne, ‘Offshore Balancing Revisited’, *The Washington Quarterly*, Spring, 2002, p.233.

¹⁰³ Noam Chomsky, *Hegemony or Survival: America’s Quest for Global Dominance*, Penguin, London, 2004, p. 191.

¹⁰⁴ Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Choice: Global Domination or Global Leadership*, Basic Books, New York, 2004, p. 27.

¹⁰⁵ Timothy Garton Ash, *Free World: Why a Crisis of the West Reveals the Opportunity of Our Time*, Penguin, 2005, London, p. 117.

¹⁰⁶ The term ‘realpolitik’ denotes the practice of diplomacy based on material and practical factors rather than ideals or moral or ethical values. The term was first used by a German writer and politician, Ludwig von Rochau, in 1853, became associated with the politics of Bismarck and was later popularized by Henry Kissinger. Its hallmark is an approach to diplomacy in which influence is maximised by a pragmatic response to given circumstances, in particular the balances of power in a given situation, as opposed to the pursuit of moral objectives. This amoral quality leads to an association with a Machiavellian approach to international politics.

¹⁰⁷ Wilsonianism is a foreign policy ideology refers to idealistic principles of American President Woodrow Wilson, based on the fourteen points he laid out as a guide for negotiations at the end of World War I. Wilson introduced his points not only to bring an end of the First World War but with the aim of establishing principles that would achieve a world without fear and war. This approach has characterised the idealistic aspect of much of US foreign policy in the 20th century and its more recent guise has been that of liberal internationalism, which has favoured interventionism to promote capitalism, democracy and national self-determination.

¹⁰⁸ Andrea K. Riemer, U.S. foreign policy from Bush to Bush: Enduring parameters and policy options Part 3: The Bush43 presidencies – Policy options, *AARMS Security*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 2008, p. 119

As 9/11 impacted and affected South Asia more than any other region, and the region became a theatre of the global War on Terror, so the United States changed its policy drastically toward it. US policy toward South Asia in the aftermath of 9/11 (after a short drift) seems to indicate a tilt toward India. This tilt and the subsequent Indo-US strategic partnership, was not a sudden move but the result of a gradual convergence of interests which began with the collapse of the Soviet Union and India's own policy of economic liberalisation.¹⁰⁹ Indo-US cooperation against the global War on Terror therefore paved the way for strategic cooperation.

Indo-US relations for almost six decades can be characterised as a combination of estrangement and engagement. Neither were they totally estranged and nor did they enjoy the same deep engagement that both enjoy with other states, India's relations with Soviets being an example, as have been US relations with the UK. With the changes to international political calculations, Indo-US relations also shifted from estrangement to a greater engagement and cooperation.¹¹⁰ The transformation of Indo-US relations started during the Clinton Administration, were accelerated by President Bush, and then continued to take an upward trajectory based on ideas about US strategic interests that were forged in the aftermath of 9/11. If President Clinton's visit was a turning point, then President Bush's initiative was a tipping point in Indo-US relations.

It is important to note that in second term of the Bush Administration, there has not seen any major change of basic principles of US foreign policy. All the main elements of Bush conceptual apparatus were in place in the 2002 NSS. US policy in supporting democratic movement, freedom, human dignity, rule of law, strengthening alliance in fighting terrorism, working to prevent from the danger of attacks and developing WMDs, working with others in resolving regional conflicts, and developing cooperative relations with global power centres to meet the challenges of the present century remained more or less the same and were reasserted in the NSS of 2006.

Likewise 2002 NSS, 2006 NSS mentioned that the goal of the US for the whole of South Asian region would be a democratic, prosperous, and peaceful region. In comparing to NSS of 2002 with that of 2006 NSS, it can safely be said that although Bush policy toward many international issues had evolved, his attitude to India has not

¹⁰⁹ Interview with Satu Limaye in Washington DC, 3 December 2012.

¹¹⁰ Kanti Bajpai, 'U.S. and Us', *India International Centre Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 3/4, India 60 (winter 2006-Spring 2007), pp. 94-5.

changed all that much, or rather it evolved organically. In 2006 NSS President Bush said: ‘We have set aside decades of mistrust and put relations with India, the world’s most populous democracy, on a new and fruitful path’.¹¹¹ If the principles guiding the foreign policy of the Bush administration, and those affecting its relations with India, had become clear by 2002, the unfolding momentous events following 9/11 would inevitably affect the implementation of those principles. It is therefore important to trace the implementation of those principles in order to establish the extent to which principles were effectively turned into action.

¹¹¹*The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, March 16, 2006, The White House.

CHAPTER – FOUR

The Bush Administration – Implementation of Policies toward India

4.1 Introduction

It is a well-known phenomenon in American politics that incoming presidents tend to disparage the foreign policies of the previous presidents, either by saying that the last administration did too little or too much. President Bush was not an exception, and followed the same style, criticising the Clinton Administration in two opposite ways. As has been discussed in the last chapter, although President Bush did not have a great deal of foreign policy experience, even he criticised his predecessor's foreign policy. Initially, before 9/11, he criticised President Clinton for doing too much and later after the terrorist incident he criticized him for doing too little in foreign affairs.¹

The importance of Asian countries was increasing in US foreign policy at the beginning of the 21st century and the strategic significance of the region continued to rise during the entire period of the Bush Administration. 9/11 drew the US's focus onto South Asia, and brought the region onto the front burner. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate how the principles on which Bush's foreign policy were based were translated into practical action in the region, and particularly toward India.

The first Bush Administration's policy was dominated by the effect of 9/11, the invasion of Afghanistan and preparing for the invasion of Iraq. But by 2004 Indo-US ties had improved remarkably, especially in defence cooperation, and Bush took steps in the first year of his second administration to leave some lasting marks on Indo-US relations. A number of economic and security-related initiatives were taken to tighten their relationship. They signed a ten-year defence framework agreement, an open sky agreement, initiated the civilian nuclear cooperation, civilian space cooperation, increased high-technology trade, military-to-military relations, arms sales, missile

¹ Stephen Sestanovich, *Maximalist: America in the World from Truman to Obama*, Vintage Books, New York, 2014, p. 275

defense, and economic cooperation which tripled bilateral trade between 2004 and 2008.²

Assessing the Bush Administration's policies toward India as it was drawing to a close, Henry Kissinger said: 'The relationship with India is one of the very positive things that is happening. We can cooperate with them both on ideological grounds and on strategic grounds. It's one of the positive legacies that the new administration will inherit'.³ With this background, I will discuss below in detail the practical changes made by the Bush Administration toward India.

4.2 Next Steps in the Strategic Partnership - NSSP: A New Approach

After assuming the US presidency, George W. Bush set about furthering the Indo-US relationship that Clinton had begun to strengthen. The strategic engagement between them was one of the significant features of the Indo-US relations in the last decade. The first tangible step on this path of engagement occurred when President Bush and Prime Minister Singh met in November 2001 in Washington, and agreed to enhance cooperation first in security issues, civilian nuclear energy, space and scientific technology, and second in expanding economic relations.⁴

As a part of their commitment made in Washington in 2001, the two countries worked in a number of different areas to strengthen their bilateral relation and cooperation and, on 12 January 2004, they announced the Next Steps in Strategic Partnership – NSSP - in implementing their shared vision. The NSSP initiative encompassed a number of major issues in Indo-US relations. India had been pressing the US to soften its restrictions on exports to India related to dual-use high-technology, to increase civilian nuclear cooperation, and to increase civilian space cooperation. These three issues were known as the 'trinity', though they later became the quartet with the inclusion of missile defence cooperation. In a joint statement, the US and India also declared their

²K. Alan Kronstadt, Paul K. Kerr, Michael F. Martin and Bruce Vaughn, India: Domestic Issues, Strategic Dynamics, and U.S. Relations, Congressional Research Service, September 1, 2011.

³ Karl F. Inderfurth, *US-India Relations in America's Role in Asia: Asian and American Views, Recommendations for US Policy From Both Sides of the Pacific*, The Asia Foundation, San Francisco, 2008, p.253.

⁴Umbreen Javaid & Qamar Fatima, 'US Foreign Policy Parameters towards Pakistan and India (2001-2008)', *Journal of Political Studies*, Vol. 19, Issue -2, 2012, pp. 31-32.

relationship as partners in the War on Terror and in controlling the proliferation of WMDs, transforming their vision of bilateral strategic partnership into a reality.⁵

This NSSP initiative opened a strategic dialogue between the US and India, with India accepting the needs to better control its export regime, while at the same time expecting access to US technology in return.⁶ The unveiling of the NSSP provided the earliest sign of a sea change in Indo-US relations, in which President Bush chose strategic engagement with India. This fundamental transformation in Indo-US relations was possible because both countries treated each other with an entirely different approach, outside of the Cold War prism. They found each other genuine in their desire to build a strategic partnership⁷ and this paved the way for greater energy security, strategic, and economic cooperation.

Since January 2004, the two countries have been working together through a number of cumulative steps⁸ to materialise the first phase of the NSSP. On 17 September 2004, New Delhi and Washington announced that there had been progress on the NSSP initiative, and mentioned in a joint statement that the implementation of the NSSP would bring substantial economic benefits as well as bringing enhanced regional and global security. The statement also said that the US and India would continue to go forward under the NSSP.⁹ On 18 July 2005, the US State Department announced that the US and India had successfully completed the NSSP and considered it a 'milestone' in the Indo-US strategic relationship.¹⁰ The NSSP should be considered a pivotal moment in developing Indo-US relationship toward a greater cooperation and strategic partnership.

⁵ Statement by the President on *Next Steps in Strategic Partnership with India*, January 12, 2004, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/p/sca/rls/pr/28109.htm>, accessed 15 October 2015.

⁶ South Asia Monitor, Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, Number 84, July 4, 2005, p.1

⁷ Ashley J. Tellis, *Opportunities Unbound: Sustaining the Transformation in U.S.-Indian Relations*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington DC, 2013, p. 6.

⁸ These steps included expanded engagement on nuclear regulatory and safety issues, enhanced cooperation in missile defense, peaceful uses of space technology, and steps to create the appropriate environment for increased high-technology commerce.

⁹ United States - India Joint Statement on Next Steps in Strategic Partnership, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2004/36290.htm>, accessed 15 October 2015.

¹⁰ Fact Sheet, U.S. Department of State, Washington, DC, July 18, 2005, available at <http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/article/2005/07/20050718185135cpataruk0.4649774.html#axzz3omhMLdX9>, accessed 15 October 2015.

4.3 Initiatives and Agreements between the US and India under the Bush Administration beyond the NSSP

In accordance with the US pursuit of its strategic objectives in South Asia, Washington needed to maintain a close strategic partnership with New Delhi. Indo-US solidarity against transnational terrorism paved the way for cooperation. America acknowledged the importance of India's emerging role in the international arena and its place in the reconstruction of international institutions. There were frequent discussions in the US about making India a fully-fledged partner in managing international order. But at the same time, the US also had to make sure that it was capable of retaining a long-term partnership with Pakistan as well, which became a dilemma after 9/11. So India became a partner in strategy and Pakistan a partner in necessity.¹¹

Now I will discuss below some of the important initiatives and agreements that took place during the Bush Administration between the United States and India.

4.3.1 Ten Years of Defence Relations

During a nine-day visit to Washington in June 2005, the Indian Defence Minister Pranab Mukherji signed a ten-year US-India Defence Agreement with US Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld. The agreement was titled 'New Framework for the US-India Defence Relationship'. The NFDR gave credibility to the Bush Administration's promise to help India become a major power in the international sphere in the 21st century.¹² The agreement focused on four main aspects of strengthening military cooperation and building a greater understanding between the defence establishments of the two countries. They were: maintaining security and stability, combating terrorism and religious extremism, preventing the proliferation of WMDs and the means to deliver them, data and technology, and protecting the free flow of trade through land, sea and air routes.¹³ It was massively ambitious in size and scope, vastly expansive, and brought the US and India together in collaborating in multinational operations in their common interest.¹⁴

¹¹Interview with Thomas Lynch in Washington DC, 5 December 2012.

¹²Chidanand Rajghatta, 'India, US Sign Defence Pact', *The Times of India*, June 29, 2005

¹³Patryk Kugiel, 'United States-India: Partnership of Democracies for the 21st Century', *PISM Research Papers*, No. 14, May 2010, p. 35

¹⁴Subhash Kapila, 'New Framework For The U.S-India Defence Relationship', *Intelli Briefs*, July 6, 2005.

It is important to mention here that although this agreement was not a defence pact, being only a 'Framework for Defence Relationship', it was the first time ever that such an agreement had been signed between India and the US. An agreement of this kind between two big countries signified collateral implications in every sphere and it was to become an element of broader Indo-US strategic partnership.¹⁵ The expansion of defence trade and expanding collaboration in missile defence were also major parts of the framework agreement.¹⁶ Consequently, in July of that year, Prime Minister Singh and President Bush issued a joint statement agreeing 'to transform the relationship between them and establish a global partnership'.¹⁷

Under the framework, high military personnel and political leaders from both sides started visiting each other's country repeatedly with a special focus on institutional dialogue on defence cooperation, on boosting other security initiatives, and on high-tech cooperation, energy cooperation, defence procurement, and military research.¹⁸

From this agreement, it is clear how the Bush Administration had re-evaluated its security partnership with India. As discussed earlier, with the rise of China and Islamic fundamentalism, the Bush Administration redefined the strategic significance of India as a prospective and potential partner in the region in providing peace, security, and stability in the Indian Ocean and in shaping the Asian balance of power. By this point, Indo-US relations had started coming out of the frostiness caused by strong US-Pakistan ties. Both New Delhi and Washington adjusted their bilateral relations, recognizing their susceptibility to the same global threats of terrorism and climate change. Evidence of this can be seen in the US's acceptance of India's offer of full cooperation after 9/11, and its support for the Bush Administration's proposed missile system. No country can uphold its values and achieve its national interests without the help of friends and allies. The Indo-US redefined strategic partnership was the result of such thinking and the changed international political scenario. Considering this fact, Ambassador Blackwill

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Sridhar Krishnaswami, 'India, U.S Sign Framework for Defence Cooperation', *The Hindu*, June 30, 2005.

¹⁷ Indo-US Joint Statement, *The Hindu*, July 31, 2005.

¹⁸ U.S. & India Sign 10-Year Defense Pact, *Defence Industry Daily*, June 30, 2005.

said that ‘President Bush has a global approach to US-India relations, consistent with the rise of India as a world power’.¹⁹

4.3.2 The Open Sky Agreement

An open sky agreement exists to liberalize commercial international air travel between two countries. The aim of such an agreement is to provide and ensure reasonable, suitable, and efficient services to the passengers, removing the interference by the government authority in the prices and routes of commercial airlines. It not only aims to expand trade thereby provide substantial economic growth and benefits but it opens the numerous doors to new cultural links worldwide. The United States has open sky agreements with more than 100 countries, including India.²⁰

The US Open Sky Agreement with India signed in April 2005 was another example of increased cooperation between the two countries. It was a landmark agreement signed by Praful Patel, the Minister of State for Civil Aviation, and Norman Y. Mineta, the visiting US Transportation Secretary, allowing any number of airlines to operate any number of flights to any part of the other’s country. It replaced the 50year-old ‘Air Services Agreement’ of 1956. This agreement was intended to make possible greater trade and economic cooperation between India and the United States. Before the agreement, Indian airlines were limited to flying to only a few American cities – New York, Newark, Los Angeles, and Chicago. After this agreement, they were able to fly directly to those cities and other regional hubs like Houston and Minneapolis. In the meantime, US airlines were permitted to fly non-stop to Indian major cities and the agreement also eliminated restrictive requirements on cargo flights.²¹

After signing the agreement, Secretary Mineta said: ‘As Secretary of State Rice noted during her visit to India last month, the Bush Administration’s position is clear: America is committed to helping India become a major world power in the 21st Century. A strong Indian aviation system is a core component of reaching that goal’.²² Although the agreement came six years after the US-Pakistan Open Sky Agreement of 1999, the

¹⁹ Ashok Sharma, The U.S.-India Strategic Partnership: An Overview of Defense and Nuclear Courtship’, *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, July 4, 2013.

²⁰ Open Skies Partnerships: Expanding the Benefits of Freer Commercial Aviation, *Fact Sheet*, Bureau of Public Affairs, March 29, 2011.

²¹ India, U.S. sign ‘open skies’ agreement, *The Hindu*, April 15, 2005.

²² United States, India Sign Open Skies Aviation Agreement, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/e/eeb/rls/prsr/2005/44623.htm>, accessed 19 October 2015.

number of passengers and cargo services increased after the US and India signed the accord. Prices fell²³ and consumers benefited, which in turn, boosted the economy and business of both countries. This agreement with India was not anything special, but it was in part a goodwill gesture helping to develop US relations with India.

4.3.3 Energy, Environment, and Public Health

There was another set of areas where Indo-US cooperation became pertinent to building the state capacity. It was clear that energy was a critical component of state power, as without sufficient, secure, clean, reliable, and affordable energy, strengthening the economic growth of any country was impossible. Therefore, the Bush administration pledged to help India in promoting a stable and efficient energy market, and, to this, the ‘US-India Energy Dialogue’ was initiated in May 2005 for bilateral energy cooperation.²⁴ It was aimed at promoting increased trade and investment in the energy sector. This high-level dialogue consisted of five working groups i) Oil and Gas; and ii) Coal; iii) Power and Energy Efficiency; iv) New Technologies and Renewable Energy; v) Civil Nuclear Cooperation.²⁵

During Manomohon Singh’s visit to Washington in July 2005, the leaders of the both countries declared a joint statement to establish a global partnership between them through increased cooperation on global common issues like energy, environment, climate change, democracy, security, high-technology, and space development, where, under the heading of ‘Energy and Environment’, it declared it would ‘strengthen energy security and promote the development of stable and efficient energy markets in India ...’²⁶ The statement also said that Indo-US relations would be taken to a higher plane. The State Department declared it a ‘milestone’ in the Indo-US strategic partnership.²⁷

To meet growing demand from India, Washington and New Delhi agreed to closely work together to produce clean, secure, reliable and affordable energy. They believed

²³In Search of Open Skies: Easing restrictions on foreign airlines can only rejuvenate the aviation sector, *The Indian Express*, March 1, 2014.

²⁴K. Alan Kronstadt, Paul K. Kerr, Michael F. Martin and Bruce Vaughn, *CRS Report, op.cit*, 2011, p. 54.

²⁵ Charles K. Ebinger and Vikram Singh Mehta, ‘Time to Act on India-US Energy Cooperation’, *India-US Policy Memo*, Brookings, January 2015.

²⁶Joint Statement by President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, White House Press Release, Office of the Press Secretary, Washington, DC, July 18, 2005, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/p/sca/rls/pr/2005/49763.htm> accessed on 22 October 2015.

²⁷Syed Shahid Hussain Bukhari, ‘India-United States Strategic Partnership: Implications for Pakistan’, *Berkeley Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan 2011, p. 9.

that Indo-US cooperation could strengthen efforts to manage greenhouse gas emissions and reduce air pollution harmful for the environment without hindering economic growth and development. Under the agreement both the US and India would promote the commercial deployment of clean coal technologies which worked to create zero-sum emissions. The US and India together with China, Australia, Japan, South Korea would work to improve energy security and reduce greenhouse gas emissions in ways contributing to economic growth, which was known as the 'Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate'.²⁸

Indo-US cooperation on public health has a long and productive history. This cooperation continued through the entire period of the Bush Administration, as evidenced by an increasing number of grants, bilateral agreements, programmes, and technical assistance initiatives. Over the years, the United States and India have established a robust collaboration in public health, covering issues from HIV to malaria and polio, from reproductive to maternal and child health, from TB to tobacco control, vaccine development, environmental and occupational health, and from avian influenza to emerging infectious diseases. In a joint statement of 2005, the two leaders, President Bush and Prime Minister Singh committed to strengthen their collaboration and establish a corporate fund for the fight against HIV/AIDS and institutions of both countries were working in vaccine development.²⁹

In 2003, the Bush Administration declared the President's 'Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief'. It was the biggest international health initiative ever by a single country to address a single disease. The US increased funding in FY2006 to 29.3 million dollars. Through this plan, the United States and its partners have been working with India to support the third 'National AIDS Control Plan (2006-2011)'. In FY2007 India received 29.9 million dollars to support an integrated HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care programme. The United States also accepted drugs developed in India for use in AIDS treatment worldwide.³⁰

²⁸Fact Sheet: The US-India Relationship: A Strategic Partnership, September 26, 2008, available at <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2008/09/20080926-10.html>, accessed October 21, 2015.

²⁹ Fact Sheet, U.S.-India Cooperation in Health, Biomedical Research, Bureau of Oceans, Environment and Science Washington, DC, March 7, 2006, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/p/sca/rls/fs/2006/62716.htm> accessed on 21 October 2015.

³⁰Fact Sheet on Indo-US Cooperation in Public Health, April 2, 2008, available at <http://kolkata.usconsulate.gov/wwwhipr040208a2.html>, accessed on 21 October 2015.

The United States and India also expanded their bilateral collaboration in fighting and preventing avian influenza. The Bush Administration promised 629 million US dollars to combat avian influenza to NGOs, and international organizations. India received 4.7 million US dollar in FY2007 for Indo-US collaborative programmes on seasonal influenza, avian influenza, and pandemic preparedness. They agreed to extend their programme to the private sector and develop strategies of regional communications, and planned in-region response exercises.³¹

The United States also committed to eliminate polio from India and for this it provided technical and financial support. For preventing and treating TB, USAID provided 4.17 million dollars to the World Health Organization during the Bush Administration. TB caused more than 300,000 deaths every year in India. The US Department of Health and Human Services had a long relationship of collaboration with the Indian Council of Medical Research and the National Institute of Cholera and Enteric Diseases for many years.³²

The initiatives and agreements regarding energy, environment and public health undertaken by Washington and New Delhi was a step looking forward for a leading role by the US and India in international sphere. Through their Energy Dialogue they developed cooperation in a number of fields including oil, gas, and renewable energy. Civil nuclear cooperation was prominent and this later paved the way for signing Indo-US Nuclear Deal. The Indo-US strategic and global partnership was broad in nature and scope, with the two nations working hand-in-hand on global energy security, clean environment, climate change, public health, trade, and education. With the help and cooperation from the USAID grant, India has been able to fighting successfully the diseases that caused huge deaths in the past.

4.3.4 US-India High Technology Cooperation

Indo-US high-technology cooperation and commerce came to light only after the joint statement issued in November 2001 by US President George Bush and Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee, in which they decided to transform the Indo-US relations into a partnership. Science and technology have always been a significant element of this

³¹Vikas Slathia, Master's Thesis on 'United States-India Strategic Partnership: Opportunities and Challenges in the Twenty-first Century', Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 2006, p. 73.

³²Fact Sheet on Indo-US Cooperation in Public Health, April 2, 2008, available at <http://kolkata.usconsulate.gov/wwwhipr040208a2.html>, accessed on 21 October 2015.

partnership. Both countries agreed they should discuss the ways and means to boost bilateral high-technology cooperation and should initiate a bilateral dialogue analysing the processes of transferring dual-use and military apparatus in order to ensure greater transparency. They also agreed to begin discussions on civil space cooperation as both sides have mutual interests in space.³³

Since 2001, India and the US have undertaken various initiatives for high-technology cooperation. First among other initiatives was the 'India-US High Technology Cooperation Group' (the HTCG) announced through a joint statement in 2002 by the then Under Secretary of the US Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS), Kenneth I. Juster, during his visit to New Delhi. It was aimed at promoting high-technology trade.³⁴ In February 2003, 14 guiding principles were set for the HTCG, known as the 'Statement of Principles for US-India High Technology Commerce' for removing the barriers to such trade.³⁵ July 2003 saw the inauguration session of the HTCG where officials discussed a wide range of issues regarding the expansion of bilateral high technology trade. They recognized four areas of priority focus for Indo-US bilateral commerce in advanced technology. The areas were a) defense and strategic trade, b) biotechnology, c) information technology, and d) nanotechnology. Since the establishment of the HTCG meeting were held annually.³⁶ In 2005 they established a High Technology Defence Working Group. India was formally designated as an eligible country for the 'Validated End User' programme in October 2007. In 2007, a meeting of the Joint Working Group on civilian space cooperation was held in Washington where both sides expressed their satisfactions with increasing bilateral relations in this field.³⁷ The sixth meeting was held in New Delhi on 28-29 February 2008.

India and the US agreed to work together in supporting the creation of dynamic, innovative and knowledge-based economies. Condoleezza Rice and Indian Science &

³³Saroj Bishoyi, 'US-India Security Relations: Focus on Post 9/11 Period' in Amulya K. Tripathy (Ed.), *Post 9/11 United States-India Relations: Towards an Active Engagement*, Reference Press, New Delhi, 2013, pp. 265-6.

³⁴India-US High Technology Cooperation Group, Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, available at <http://mea.gov.in/in-focus-topic.htm?54/IndiaUS+High+Technology+Cooperation+Group> accessed on 21 October 2015.

³⁵Saroj Bishoyi, India-US High Technology Cooperation: Moving Forward, *IDSA Comment*, Institute of Defence Studies and Analyses, February 16, 2011.

³⁶India-US 6th High Technology Cooperation Group (HTCG) Meeting New Delhi - February 28-29, 2008, Washington, DC, February 29, 2008, available at https://www.indianembassy.org/archives_details.php?nid=1042 accessed on 21 October 2015.

³⁷K. Alan Kronstadt, 'India-US Relations', *CRS Report*, Congressional Research Service, January 30, 2009, p. 46.

Technology Minister Kapil Sibal signed an agreement on science and technology cooperation between the two countries in October 2005. The purpose of the agreement was to boost cooperation in areas of mutual benefit, ranging from health to space technology. The agreement was not only designed to strengthen and promote science and the technology capabilities of both countries but also to expand the relations between the communities involved in these fields.³⁸

Other features of the agreements were:

1. To establish Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) protocols, as it was critical to promote a creative and technologically advanced economy. In order to strengthen the enforcement of the patent examination, the United States is funding the IPR training programme.³⁹
2. To provide a framework for a vigorous public-private partnership, a bi-national and Joint Science and Technology Commission was to be created.
3. To generate a cooperative partnership Washington and New Delhi created a fund of \$30 million and established a bi-national Science and Technology Commission.
4. Both nations agreed to continue further cooperation in civilian space which would include space exploration, satellite navigation, and earth science.⁴⁰
5. To remove certain Indian organisations from the Entity List of the US Department of Commerce, as embarked on by the NSSP.⁴¹

In March 2006, due to the expanding role of science and technology, the United States and India established two important bodies, namely the 'Bi-National Science and Technology Commission' and a 'Joint Science and Technology Endowment Fund' focusing on innovation, entrepreneurship, and commercialization.

³⁸Zafar Nawaz Jaspal, 'The Indo-US Strategic Relationship and Pakistan's Security', *SASSI Research Report 9*, South Asian Strategic Stability Institute, London, December 2007, p. 22.

³⁹ Annual Report, Indo-US Science & Technology Forum, April 2005 to March 2006, p. 17.

⁴⁰Kulwant Rai Gupta, *Indo-US Civil Nuclear Deal*, Volume 2, Atlantic Publishers & Dist, India, 2007, p. 370.

⁴¹Vikas Slathia, 'United States-India Strategic Partnership: Opportunities and Challenges in the Twenty-first Century', p. 71

With the emergence of India's information technology capacities and biotechnology, life sciences and nanotechnology sectors, its economy had changed dramatically; the formation of US-India Technology Cooperation facilitated Indo-US trade in high technology items and demonstrated how both the US and India were working together in building a better future.

4.4 Expanding Defence Cooperation

In international relations, defence relationships between the countries are known as the last mile of cooperation.⁴² In light of his conceptual thinking, Bush was committed to having a long-term strategic partnership with India, and regarded it not only as an emerging global power but also a regional security provider. Professor Stephen Cohen argued that Indo-US relations until the end of the 20th century could generally be seen as indifferent but he called the 2005 initiative of NFDR a positive milestone. Since then, both countries have been reviewing the prospect of their long-term defence relationship, and, although they have different motives, their strategic visions have been converging day by day.⁴³

In fact, the major shift in the Indo-US defence relationship started just after September 2001 when the US lifted sanctions against India,⁴⁴ and defence cooperation between them made further substantial progress during the second term of the Bush Administration. The defence protocol of 2005 became one of the pillars of the defence relationship, which also included joint exercises, exchanges of personnel, the purchase of equipment and the joint development of new weapon systems. Before that, in January 2004, the US and India announced that, in order to form a strategic partnership between them they had agreed to expand mutual cooperation in three main areas: non-military or civilian nuclear activities, space programmes, and high-technology commerce. Subsequently, in March 2006, President Bush visited India and agreed to strategically strengthen Indo-US relations, which led to the historic civil nuclear deal which I will discuss in full length later in the chapter in a separate section.

⁴² Rahul Bhonsle, 'Prospects of Indo-US Defence Partnership: A Prognosis', *Scholar Warrior*, Autumn, 2012, p. 32.

⁴³ Interview with Professor Stephen Cohen in Washington DC, 7 December 2012.

⁴⁴ Defense Cooperation with India - Expanding Again, Major Greg Winston, USA Office of Defense Cooperation, New Delhi, India, *The DISAM Journal*, Summer 2005, p. 7.

At the end of the Bush Administration, Indo-US defence ties became strong and were still growing. The policies of the Administration were designed to build the foundation for a long-term strategic partnership, so now I will discuss below what steps and efforts were taken in realising the intended goals.

4.4.1 Military Exercises

The US conducted more joint military exercises with India than with any other country in the world during the Bush Administration. Indo-US joint military exercises grew dramatically not only in terms of size, number but in sophistication also. Since 2002, they have had frequent and regular exercises, including all wings of their respective militaries, in order to deepen their defence relationship. During this period, the defence relationship between them was quite encouraging and they had more than 60 joint military exercises.⁴⁵

Special Forces from both sides were also the part of joint exercises programme. A number of soldiers from the US Special Forces have attended India's Counter-Insurgency Jungle Warfare School. In the joint exercises, the Indian military was exposed to US sophisticated military hardware, which increased the Indian interest in US equipment. Joint exercises included heliborne operations, counter-terrorism training in tackling guerrilla and clandestine warfare, mountain warfare, jungle warfare, and close-quarter combat. In 2004, for the first time since 1963, fighter aircrafts from both countries participated in air combat training. India also conducted its largest strategic deployment of combat aircraft outside its boundary, in Alaska in the same year.⁴⁶

Indo-US Naval cooperation laid the foundation for military-to-military cooperation. The US and Indian Navies conducted joint naval exercise Malabar 07-1 off the coast of Okinawa in April 2007 and Malabar 07-2 off the coast of the Bay of Bengal in September of the same year. The Malabar 07-2 exercises involved anti-air, anti-submarine, and anti-surfaces warfare. It is important to note here that Malabar is the primary bilateral exercise among four exercises, which are the Habu Nag, Spitting

⁴⁵Military pacts on hold but India, US continue with exercises, arms deals', *The Times of India*, September 22, 2010, available at <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Military-pacts-on-hold-but-India-US-continue-with-exercises-arms-deals/articleshow/6601777.cms> accessed on 24 October, 2015.

⁴⁶Defense Cooperation with India - Expanding Again, Major Greg Winston, USA Office of Defense Cooperation, New Delhi, India, *The DISAM Journal*, Summer 2005, p. 10.

Cobra, and Salvex.⁴⁷ Malabar maritime exercise is conducted in order to strengthen the maritime procedures, tactics and techniques of the countries involved.

4.4.2 Arms Sales

US arms sales to India was an essential element in expanding the defence relationship between the US and India when the respective political leaders met in Washington in November 2001. Later, the 'quartet', the NSSP and the framework of 2005, all led and broadened the opportunities for arms sales for US companies to India. The Indo-US strategic partnership was intended not only to assist India in nuclear technology but also facilitate the selling of highly sophisticated arms to India, including missiles, supersonic fighter jets, and other military equipment. This arms sale widened the persistent gap and made Indo-Pak relations more hostile, but this time reversing the traditional balance of power.⁴⁸ This offer of arms sales was to mitigate India's unhappiness about the US announcement of releasing \$1 billion dollars of arms to Pakistan.

The Bush Administration remained committed to being a reliable arms supplier to India and US arms sales occupied a higher place during his two terms. After 2002, the US started a number of government-to-government arms sale to India, and India signed more than 20 foreign military sales cases which included C-17 and C-130J aircraft, and an ambitious transport dock along with six associated helicopters, TPQ-37 radars, Raytheon Firefinder artillery radars, self-protection suites for a VVIP aircraft, General Electric GE-F404 engines for India's light combat aircraft, GE-LM-2500 gas turbines for Indian naval ships, Harpoon Block II missiles, specialised tactical equipment, Hercules transport aircraft, Sensor-Fuzed weapons, and carrier flight and Boeing P-8 Poseidon maritime patrol aircraft.⁴⁹ Between 2001 and 2004, US arms sales to India reached \$400 million and from 2005-2008 it increased substantially to more than \$3 billion. The United States became India's third largest defence supplier after Russia and Israel. So arms sales to India were considered a major component of US strategic relations with India.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ *Report to Congress on U.S.-India Security Cooperation*, US Department of Defense, November 2011, p.3.

⁴⁸ Syed Shahid Hussain Bukhari, 'India-United States Strategic Partnership: Implications for Pakistan', *Berkeley Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan 2011, p. 21.

⁴⁹ K. Alan Kronstadt, 'India-US Relations', *CRS Report*, *op. cit.*, 2009, pp. 49-50.

⁵⁰ Dinshaw Mistry, 'US Arms Sales to India', *Asia Pacific Bulletin*, No. 271, 8 July 2014, East-West Center, Washington.

The Bush Administration's decision to sell arms to India had three implications. Firstly, the US took India as a serious strategic partner, cherishing the same strategic views and concerns; secondly, the US recognised India's strategic role to be played in the region and in the international sphere; finally, and most obviously, arms sales and technology transfer to India demonstrated the fact that the US considered India as a preferred friend. Indian policy-makers saw this arms sale as a way of gaining influence.⁵¹

4.4.3 Civil Space Cooperation and Missile Defence

India sought access to US space technology for a long time in order to benefit its defence missile programmes. Both the US and India heavily relied on space technologies, and, on the technical level, India possessed considerable knowledge, skills, and experience. With US cooperation, India could advance its scientific endeavours. Indo-US space cooperation dated back to the 1960s when scientists from India were trained in the US, and in 1963 when the US launched a sounding rocket from India's Thumba rocket facility. Indo-US space cooperation during that time was restricted by the possible reactions from across the rest of Asia, but was getting traction, with prompting and support from both sides.⁵²

During the Bush Administration, India made remarkable progress in space technology. The NSSP of 2004 and the 2005 initiative called for enhanced Indo-US cooperation on the peaceful use of space technology and a closer relation in satellite navigation, space exploration, and also in the commercial space arena. In 2004 and 2005, conferences on Indo-US space science and commerce were held in the Indian city of Bangalore. In 2006, during President Bush's visit to India, both nations committed to go further with the agreements, permitting the launch of US satellites by Indian space launch vehicles, including two US scientific instruments on India's planned Chandrayaan lunar mission. In the following year, the US-India Joint Working Group on Civil Space Cooperation was held in Washington, and reviewed the progress and ties in the field of aerospace. On 22 October 2008, India launched the Chandrayaan-1 to orbit the moon and closely examine its surface, and this marked India as an important player in space exploration.⁵³

⁵¹Stephen J. Blank, 'Natural Allies? Regional Security in Asia and Prospects for Indo-American Strategic Cooperation', *Strategic Studies Institute*, U.S. Army War College, September 2005, p. 106.

⁵²Bharath Gopalaswamy, 'Indo-U.S. Space Cooperation: Aiming Higher', *Issue Perspective*, Vol. 1, Issue 2, CSIS, August 11, 2011, pp.1-2.

⁵³K. Alan Kronstadt, 'India-US Relations', *CRS Report*, *op. cit.*, 2009, pp. 45-6.

4.5 Counterterrorism Cooperation and Intelligence

Counterterrorism cooperation between the US and India has become one of the pillars of their partnership since 9/11. Both countries have experienced terrorist attacks against their land and interests, which bound them to work together in the War on Terror. It was not only after the 9/11 terrorist attack but also before that they started working together closely to counter terrorism. This dated back to 1999 when the India–US Joint Working Group on Counterterrorism was established. So the Indo-US counterterrorism cooperation has had a longer record than the US's cooperation with many of its other allies. This joint working group has been meeting regularly since its inception and by the end of the Bush Administration it had met 10 times.⁵⁴

One month after the 9/11 attacks, Secretary Powell visited India on 16-17 October and the two nations signed the Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty to facilitate cooperation on law enforcement and counterterrorism.⁵⁵ After the 9/11 attacks, India immediately took the decisive and unprecedented decision of offering the US its full support and cooperation and the use of its bases for counterterrorism cooperation, in clear contradiction of India's traditional neutral policy.⁵⁶

The United States and India⁵⁷ are probably two nations in the world that have recently faced the most serious terrorist threats. India became the world's 'most terrorism-afflicted' country in 2008. India experienced over 2500 deaths in 2007 alone. In 2008, the Mumbai attacks, now known as 26/11 happened at the end of the Bush Administration, which I will discuss in the next chapter, stimulated more vocal and stronger calls for deepening Indo-US counterterrorism cooperation.

Counterterrorism needs high level of intelligence to locate the threats and to neutralise them. Terror threats are not like traditional wars in which enemies are easy to locate, identify and even predict; they are rather quite unpredictable, with enemies that are difficult to locate because they are mobile, highly flexible and spread all over the

⁵⁴ Patryk Kugiel, *op.cit.*, p. 42.

⁵⁵ Satu P. Limaye, U.S.-India Relations: Visible to the Naked Eye, Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies.

⁵⁶ K. Alan Kronstadt, 'India-US Relations', *CRS Report, op.cit.*, 2009, p. 14.

⁵⁷ India has been a target of terrorist attacks more than the US. So expanding counterterrorism cooperation required increased information sharing and building strong bondage between the US and India.

world.⁵⁸ Because of these characteristics, after 9/11 intelligence sharing became the cornerstone of the counterterrorist effort to meet this new kind of threat.

4.6 Trade and Economic Cooperation

Due to ideological and political differences, the US economic relationship with India was not at the level it should have been until the end of the 20th century. At the time of independence, India as one of the poorest economies and backward countries followed the policy of having a centrally planned socialist economic model instead of adopting liberal capitalism. One consequence was an absence of meaningful economic cooperation with the United States. India then had the Soviet Union and third world countries as its trade and economic partners.⁵⁹ After Clinton's visit to India, the US economic cooperation with New Delhi increased and the Bush Administration continued and expanded the cooperation.

As noted earlier, since 2004 India and the US have been pursuing a 'strategic partnership' and trade and economic cooperation between them has been a major aspect of this kind of engagement. They established an 'Economic Dialogue' in 2005 to enhance trade and economic cooperation. An important element of the Economic Dialogue was the 'US-India Trade Policy Forum', responsible for cooperating efforts to address policy priorities in trade, services, investment, tariff and non-tariff barriers, intellectual property rights, and agriculture.⁶⁰ At the same time, President Bush regarded India as a new economic competitor and said in an address to the 109th Congress on 31 January 2006: 'In a dynamic world economy, we are seeing new competitors like China and India, and this creates uncertainty, which makes it easier to feed people's fears'.⁶¹

Figures indicate that the US and India made a significant progress in trade and economic cooperation. Bilateral trade in 1990 had increased by 700% by 2008, and during the eight years of the Bush Administration it increased almost four times. The United States was the largest customer for Indian exports and the second largest source of its imports after China. America was also the dominant market for Indian outsourcing

⁵⁸ Anna-Katherine Staser McGill & David H. Gray, 'Challenges to International Counterterrorism Intelligence Sharing', *Global Security Studies*, Summer 2012, Volume 3, Issue 3, p. 76

⁵⁹ Patryk Kugiel, *op.cit.*, p. 32.

⁶⁰ The President's Trade Policy Agenda, pp. 8-9 available at [https://ustr.gov/archive/assets/Document Library/Reports Publications/2008/2008 Trade Policy Agenda/asset_upload_file490_14556.pdf](https://ustr.gov/archive/assets/Document%20Library/Reports%20Publications/2008/2008%20Trade%20Policy%20Agenda/asset_upload_file490_14556.pdf) accessed on 27 October 2015.

⁶¹ George W. Bush, State of the Union Address, January 31, 2006, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/gwbush/speeches/speech-4461> accessed on 27 October 2015.

services. The balance of trade was in India's favour. Since India's population was rising and in the next 20-25 years India would be fifth largest consumer market, the US has been increasingly interested in investing in India. Foreign investment was not one-way. Indians were also investing in the United States. In 2008, Indian investment in the United States was over \$4.5bn, which was four times the value of Chinese investment.⁶²

In 2008, the value of US imports from India was \$26.1 billion, the value of exports to India was \$19.2 billion, and trade in private commercial services was more than \$13 billion. About one-seventh of FDI in India came from the US and the major US-based companies Microsoft, IBM, Oracle, and Dell have made multibillion-dollar investments in India. The increase in trade and economic cooperation was the real manifestation of the bond between the United States and India.⁶³

Every country has trade and economic relationship with other countries and India/US trade is not an exception. Although trade relations were not as important as those on security, trade did grow steadily during the Bush Administration. The two countries walked extra miles to bring the economic cooperation to the level that it should be between the two great economies and intensified their interactions in trade and economic cooperation, through economic dialogue.

4.7 The Nuclear Deal – Background

The Indo-US Nuclear Pact, signed in 2008 was one of the most important and widely debated and deliberated aspects of the US relations with India in the 21st century. The United States had a fundamental difference with India on nuclear issues which left a bitter legacy in the bilateral relationship over the years.⁶⁴ Until the end of the Cold War, their relationship had never been friendly, and in the post-Cold-War period, India's second nuclear test of 1998, and subsequent US sanctions on India, was a major hindrance to improving Indo-US relations.⁶⁵ But in international politics, it is firmly believed that 'friends and enemies are born out of circumstances', as stated by India's most esteemed strategic guru Kautilya (350-283 BCE) in his famous book *Arthashastra*. This became very much pertinent to the changed Indo-US relations in the present

⁶² Patryk Kugiel, *op.cit.*, p. 36.

⁶³ K. Alan Kronstadt, 'India-US Relations', *CRS Report, op.cit.*, 2009, pp. 56-7.

⁶⁴ Mussarat Jabeen and Ishtiaq Ahmed, 'Indo-US Nuclear Cooperation', *South Asian Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 2, July-December 2011, p.411.

⁶⁵ Muhammad Munir & Muhammad Ahsan, 'US Strategic Policy towards India and Pakistan in Post 9/11', *The Turkish Yearbook*, Vol. XXXIX, 2008, p. 154.

century and the historic nuclear deal. India, the nuclear pariah, and America, the self-acclaimed global nuclear watchdog, joined hands together. This deal could be regarded as a tectonic shift of the foreign policy of the two major democratic powers, one which made them strategic partners rather than political adversaries.⁶⁶ Nicholas Burns, whose role and contribution in making the deal was profound, depicted the deal ‘a most important progress forward for the US and the high-water mark of US-India dealings since 1947’.⁶⁷

When Secretary Rice visited India in March 2005, she said: ‘This is my first step as Secretary of State in Asia. The President has personally put a lot of time and energy into the relationship. The United States has determined that this is going to be a very important relationship going forward and we are going to put whatever time we need into it’. The intention was to take the Indo-US ties ‘to another level’⁶⁸ and the nuclear deal was the best example of it.

President Bush and Prime Minister Singh conceived the idea for the deal on 18 July 2005 in Washington, when they first announced their intentions to enter into a nuclear agreement. Their joint statement provided a roadmap for a future strategic partnership between them. In fact, this statement was clearly intended as a way of making India a global power. India agreed to separate its civilian and military nuclear facilities and put all of its nuclear facilities and programmes under IAEA safeguards in a phased manner, and the US agreed to work and extend full civil nuclear cooperation with India. Indian Prime Minister assured the world that his country would assume the same kind of responsibilities and practices as any other recognised nuclear state, and promised India’s suspension of nuclear testing. The agreement permitted India to gain civil nuclear technology from the US and other members of the NSGs, and thus declared India a *de facto* nuclear weapon state.⁶⁹ It ended India’s nuclear isolation and met its 30-year-long cherished dream to be recognised as a nuclear weapon state.⁷⁰

⁶⁶Ajeey Lele and Archana Mishra, ‘Indo-US Strategic Partnership: Beyond the Nuclear Deal’, *op.cit.*, p.96.

⁶⁷*The News*, Islamabad, July 20, 2005.

⁶⁸Sharif Shuja, ‘The United States and India’, *International Journal on World Peace*, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, June 2006, p. 35.

⁶⁹Adil Sultan Muhammad, Indo-US Civilian Nuclear Cooperation: Implications on South Asian Security Environment, *The Henry L. Stimson Center*, July, 2006, p.2.

⁷⁰Subhash Agrawal, ‘India and the United States: A New Partnership’, *The International Spectator*, Vol. 46, No. 2, 2011, p. 61.

It has been mentioned above that the nuclear issue was the principal obstacle to better Indo-US relations. Although previous US administrations had attempted to improve relations with India, none was ready to give the 'go ahead' on the nuclear issue. Due to the changed international scenario and India's growing potential the Bush Administration wanted to take India into its confidence as a global partner,⁷¹ and therefore broke the deadlock on the nuclear issue and agreed to amend the 'US laws and policies' to work with friends and allies to facilitate full civil nuclear cooperation with India.⁷²

The Bush administration was successful in this attempt to cultivate friendship with India. A survey conducted by the Pew Research Centre in 2005 revealed that President Bush was unpopular in many countries in the world but was popular in India and among Indians. The survey revealed that 54% of the Indians had faith or confidence that Bush will do the right things for the world when in dealing with world affairs.⁷³ Much of this sentiment was the result of the fact that the Bush administration consistently followed the policy of de-hyphenation while dealing with India. Some US ambassadors, including Robert Blackwill, requested and emphasised increased ties with New Delhi and a policy of de-hyphenation. Professor Stephen P. Cohen was also of the opinion that the United States should follow distinct policies toward India and Pakistan, rather than just an 'India-Pakistan' policy.⁷⁴ The Indo-US nuclear deal was the result of the policy of de-hyphenation. The deal was also considered a beneficial step in setting up India as a possible counterweight to the growing Chinese influence and a potential client and job creator for the United States in the days ahead.⁷⁵ The signing of the deal removed the major barriers to Indo-US relations, and with this deal they chose to give up their mutual distrust in the past, and became strategic partners in the 21st century.

4.7.1 Implications of the Deal – Benefits for the US and India

Although the nuclear issue was one of the major obstacles to friendly Indo-US relations, the course of the deal was not easy, either in India or in the US. They had to ponder

⁷¹President Discusses Strong U.S.-India Partnership in New Delhi, India, Purana Qila, New Delhi, India, March 3, 2006, available at <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2006/03/20060303-5.html>, accessed February 24, 2018.

⁷²Harsh V. Pant, *The US-India Nuclear Pact: Policy, Process and Great Power Politics*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2011, pp.1-2.

⁷³India: Pro-America, Pro-Bush, *The Pew Research Center*, February 28, 2006, available at <http://pewglobal.org/commentary/display.php?AnalysisID=1002>

⁷⁴Interview with Stephen P. Cohen in Washington DC, 7 December 2012.

⁷⁵US wants Indian Businesses to Create Jobs in America, *The Times of India*, Feb 18, 2010.

over the deal for a longtime, face opposition at home and criticism abroad. Being democratic, both nations had to go through several messy and long processes and the deal involved strong diplomatic bargaining. It was anticipated that, after the deal, Indo-US ties would remain much stronger, as extensive diplomatic efforts had been spent in making the deal a reality.⁷⁶

Ambassador Quinton said the nuclear deal was created out of a clear understanding on the US side that India would never sign the NPT, and that the sanctions imposed on India in the past brought no result. The deal was designed to lead India toward greater transparency in its nuclear sector, which ultimately would reduce the risk of proliferation and nuclear accidents. The US anti-China strategy also played an important role in making the deal. It was also thought that it would not escalate the tensions between New Delhi and Islamabad.⁷⁷

The nuclear deal became the centrepiece of the transformed Indo-US relationship that also highlighted other issues, such as military and strategic relations, economic cooperation, fighting terrorism, and intelligence sharing, which have been discussed above. The deal did not require New Delhi to give up its nuclear programme, but stipulated that further nuclear testing would necessarily lead to Washington stopping nuclear trade with India in accordance with US laws. Richard Lugar, a Republican senator, saw this deal as a good incentive and motivation for India to restrain itself from future nuclear testing.⁷⁸

The deal undoubtedly had global and regional implications. It was obvious that the US would no longer treat the two South Asian rivals equally. The deal allowed India to purchase five billion dollars of conventional weapons from the United States and allowed for the transfer of a PAC-3 to India. The anticipated risk was that Islamabad, which was also looking for the same kind of anti-missile system for itself, would be unwilling to participate in nuclear confidence-building talks, and thus the deal could precipitate an anti-missile race in South Asia. The most vital implication of the deal was

⁷⁶ Harsh V. Pant, *The US-India Nuclear Pact: Policy, Process and Great Power Politics*, op. cit., p.3.

⁷⁷ Interview with Ambassador Anthony Quainton in Washington DC, 4 December 2012.

⁷⁸ 'Lugar floor statement on the US-India peaceful atomic energy and US-IAEA additional protocol implementation act of 2006', 15 November 2006, <http://lugar.senate.gov>.

that it was, in an indirect way, pressure on India to carry out a quantitative appraisal of how big a nuclear force it actually wished to have.⁷⁹

The deal was beneficial for both the countries. The United States needed India and was motivated by realpolitik, while for India it ended its 30 years quest for such recognition. It provided the opportunity for India to reduce its energy deficit and made Indo-US relations more cordial than ever.⁸⁰ There were a large number of economic, political and strategic benefits to the US from the deal. India placed 14 of its 22 nuclear reactors under the supervision of the IAEA, and the US companies hoped to receive multi-billion dollar contracts for reactor building.⁸¹ This also meant opening the door to thousands of jobs for US citizens.⁸²

Ensuring the safety and security of the sea-lanes in the Indian Ocean was very important to the United States, and India was considered a strategic partner to achieve that. The US also needed India on her side to moderate its image as an arrogant power after the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, and India could also have a considerable role in preventing further sliding the Middle East into anarchy. On top of that, from the beginning of the presidential campaign in 2000, the US had the intention to change the terms of Indo-US engagement,⁸³ and this nuclear deal was the culmination of that intention.

Militarily, the US benefited greatly from its relations with India. Sea-lanes in the Indian Ocean route were for 40% of the world's oil and commerce and to keep this route protected and free, India's assistance as a major military would be helpful.⁸⁴ Without signing nuclear deal with India, it would not be easy for the US to have India's assistance in protecting sea-lanes routes.

⁷⁹ Muhammad Ishaque Fani, 'The Indo-US Strategic Partnership in the Post 9/11: Implications for Pakistan', *Pakistan Vision*, Vol. 10, No. 2, p.149

⁸⁰ Prashant Hosur, 'The Indo-US Civilian Nuclear Agreement: What's the Big Deal?', *International Journal*, Spring 2010, p. 437.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p.436.

⁸² Condoleezza Rice expected that the deal will create three to five thousands new direct jobs and ten to fifteen thousand indirect jobs in the US. See *Opening Remarks by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice* before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the 'US-India Civil Nuclear Cooperation Agreement', April 05, 2006.

⁸³ Condoleezza Rice, 'Building a New Relationship with India', *Defining Ideas*, Hoover Institution, November 3, 2011, p.1.

⁸⁴ Michael Arnold, *Australia's Defence Policy: A Market State Approach?* PhD Thesis, Deakin University, 2012, pp. 138, 145.

Apart from the above benefits, President Bush himself stated the following major gains for the US:

1. The agreement would help strengthen cooperation between India and the US on energy, ‘one of the most important challenges of the 21st century’.
2. The agreement would help promote economic growth and open up an important market for American businesses ‘by paving the way for investment in India’s civilian nuclear industry for the first time ever’⁸⁵.
3. The deal would make it possible for India to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and improve its environment: ‘By sharing advanced civilian nuclear technology, we will help our friend, India, meet its growing demand for energy and lower emissions at the same time’.
4. The pact would keep the United States safe by paving the way for India to join the global effort to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.⁸⁶

Like the United States, India also received immense benefits from the deal. First and foremost was the *de facto* recognition as a nuclear power state; India was also coming close to *de jure* recognition, without having actually signed the NPT.⁸⁷ Political benefits may also have been significant considerations for India from this deal, as New Delhi had been facing sanctions for about 30 years. No sort of nuclear cooperation had been possible with India and a number of India’s nuclear scientists were not permitted to travel to a number of European countries. The nuclear pact ended these 30 years of nuclear isolation for India. After many years of isolation, India now have had the chance to contribute to world forums including the UN, WTO, the IMF, and other international organisations. This had not been the case since independence. The nuclear deal was rejecting the past and unlocking the hidden potential of the future. On top of that, it was hoped that Pakistan might take the signal and start a new way of thinking in its policies toward India.⁸⁸

⁸⁵Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, George W. Bush, Book –II, July 1 to December 31, 2006, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 2010, p. 2197.

⁸⁶Fact Sheet: The United States-India Peaceful Atomic Energy Cooperation Act, Washington, DC December 18, 2006, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/p/sca/rls/2006/77930.htm> accessed on 28 October 2015.

⁸⁷Interview with Robert M. Hathaway in Washington DC, 5 December 2012.

⁸⁸Interview with Ambassador Howard B. Schaffer in Washington DC, 5 December 2012.

Secondly, the deal increased the possibility that India might get a permanent seat on the UNSC in the future. India had been trying for a seat in the last few years but had not succeeded, and it was not likely to happen in the next 10 years.⁸⁹ But scholars in Washington saw it differently. They argued that when the UN reform movement has gained strength, and debate for restructuring takes place, India will qualify for a seat in the reformed UNSC in part⁹⁰ because the deal made India a responsible nuclear state and a major world power.

The economic benefit for India was huge. India was in urgent need of finances to build its infrastructure and the source of capital could be United States and Europe. Although the US and Europe were pleased to send capital to China, the US avoided exporting manufacturing technology or high-technology capital goods to China and trade with India in these areas was made possible by the deal.⁹¹

India also received significant benefits in the technological field. Before the deal, due to the sanctions, India was not allowed to buy supercomputers for weather forecasting. When sanctions were lifted completely, India was able to make such purchases, and Indian scientists travelled freely and participated in international conferences where they were denied before. In short, the deal contributed in a substantive way to India's overall growth.⁹²

4.7.2 Debate in India and in the US

There were a wide range of debates and reactions to the nuclear deal in India, with some in favour and some against. Debate existed amongst political leaders, parties, strategists and even within the scientific communities. Opposition political leaders in India considered the deal not in India's national interests. They argued that the deal posed a serious threat to maintaining the country's independent foreign policy and even argued that the independence and sovereignty of India had been sold out. Noted political leader, Yaswant Singh, believed that the agreement made India subservient and submissive to the US as the deal required India to follow US domestic law, the Hyde Act, which was

⁸⁹Hari Sud, 'India-US Nuclear Deal – The Benefits', *South Asia Analysis Group*, Paper No. 1740, 20 March, 2006.

⁹⁰Interview with Ambassador Anthony Quainton, Dr.Satu Limaye, Professor Deepa Ollapally in Washington DC, 4, 3, 6 (respectively) December 2012.

⁹¹ Interview with Stephen P. Cohen in Washington DC, 7 December 2012.

⁹²Gurmeet Kanwal, 'Indo-US Nuclear Deal: Implications for Non-Proliferation', *South Asian Strategic Stability Institute Research Report 10*, February 2008, p. 14.

humiliating for India⁹³ and humiliating for any sovereign country. Some analysts believed that the condition of placing India's nuclear reactor under IAEA safeguards was an attack on India's sovereignty. A prominent communist leader, the chief of a leading communist party, Prakash Karat, said that, as a result of the pact, 'India would be locked into a strategic tie-up which would have a long-lasting impact on India's foreign policy and strategic autonomy'.⁹⁴ Not only the opposition leaders but some of the top leaders of the ruling party were dubious of the pact. Despite strong opposition within and outside the government, India went for the deal so as to end its long-time nuclear isolation.⁹⁵

Many believed that the United States had its own agenda behind the deal and it wanted to gain certain strategic goals in the name of helping India. Firstly, the US wanted to get India on its side to carry out regional and global non-proliferation goals. Secondly, America wanted to make its presence felt in the Asian theatre, and finally and probably most important target was to rejuvenate US moribund nuclear industry and make huge economic gains⁹⁶ through the creation of new jobs. A Member of Parliament in India said that:

Since 1979, after an accident in Pennsylvania, the US power industry has been paralysed. In order to rejuvenate the power sector there, they had made a calculation. The calculation is that over the years they would be getting an opportunity to exploit at least 40 percent of the nuclear energy sector here in India. It will create employment to the extent of 2,70,000 and there will be to the extent 20 billion dollars of trade.⁹⁷

There were also debates on technical issues. The Department of Atomic Energy (DEA) was deeply concerned about India's technological independence, and expressed its concern that India might lose its independent technological research to such a nuclear

⁹³Yashwant Sinha, 'We Can Live without Nuclear Power', *Rediff News*, 2008, www.rediff.com

⁹⁴Prakash Karat, 'The Indo-US Nuclear Deal: Struggle to Defend National Sovereignty', *The Marxist*, Vol. XXIII, No. 3, July to September, 2007, available at http://cpim.org/marxist/200703_marxist-nuclear%20deal-prakash.pdf, accessed 9 March 2016.

⁹⁵Evan A. Feigenbaum, 'India's Rise, America's Interest: The Fate of the U.S.-Indian Partnership', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 89, No. 2, March/April 2010, pp. 83-4.

⁹⁶Muzaffar Ahemad Ganaie, 'Indo-US Civil Nuclear Deal: Issues and Concerns', in Amulya K. Tripathy (Ed.), *Post 9/11 United States-India Relations: Towards An Active Engagement*, Reference Press, New Delhi, 2013, pp. 319-20.

⁹⁷SadiaTasleem, 'Indo-US Nuclear Cooperation: Altering Strategic Positioning and Shifting Balance of Power in South Asia', *RCSS Policy Studies 44*, Regional Centre for Strategic Studies, Colombo, 2008, p. 68.

bargain. So the deal was a serious threat in eroding the autonomy of India's own research authorities, which ultimately put India in vulnerable situation.⁹⁸

Condoleezza Rice once said that those reactions and negative thoughts from both sides, especially from India, almost caused the deal to fail.⁹⁹ On the other hand, many others regarded the deal as a very welcome change in Indo-US relations and to the benefit of both nations. A group of intelligentsia considered the deal a great strategic gain for India, given that it ended India's nuclear isolation era, gave India a long-awaited acknowledgement as a *de facto* nuclear state, offered a new energy source, and gave potential opportunities for international cooperation in advanced technology.¹⁰⁰

K. Subrahmanyam, the modern strategic guru of India, enthusiastically advocated the deal, arguing that India should grasp the deal to 'demolish the technology apartheid erected around India'. He even viewed the deal as a welcome 'acceptance of India' within the broader nuclear non-proliferation regime, though not within the NPT.¹⁰¹ The deal could be considered the finest example of how the US was trying to incorporate India into the international non-proliferation framework although India was not made a member of the NSG in spite of US' efforts to make it happen.¹⁰²

In the United States, the deal was considered in a mainly positive light. Scholars and analysts in Washington believed that the Bush Administration's strategy was to cultivate a strategic partnership with India to take it to a higher plane vis-à-vis China.¹⁰³ Analysts also saw the deal in relation to the non-proliferation regime. There were two distinct group of analysts, those optimistic and those pessimistic. The optimists believed the deal strengthened the nuclear non-proliferation regime, while the pessimists believed that the deal would have a negative impact. Others within the optimists, known as the 'cautious optimists', viewed the deal as a positive development but wished to

⁹⁸Vandana Bhatia, 'The US-India Nuclear Agreement: Revisiting the Debate', *Strategic Analysis*, Vol. 36, No. 4, July-August 2012, p. 616.

⁹⁹Condoleezza Rice, 'Building a New Relationship with India', *op. cit.*, p.1.

¹⁰⁰Harsh V. Pant, *The US-India Nuclear Pact: Policy, Process and Great Power Politics*, *op. cit.*, p.13.

¹⁰¹Vandana Bhatia, 'The US-India Nuclear Agreement: Revisiting the Debate', *op.cit.*, p. 616.

¹⁰²Chandreyee Chakraborty, 'India and the United States: Emerging Parameters of Strategic Engagement', in Amulya K. Tripathy (Ed.), *Post 9/11 United States-India Relations: Towards An Active Engagement*, Reference Press, New Delhi, 2013, p. 336.

¹⁰³Vandana Bhatia, 'Change in the U.S. Nuclear Non-proliferation Policy toward India (1998-2005): Accommodating the Anomaly', *PhD Thesis*, University of Alberta, 2012, pp.31-32.

develop some sort of criterion so there was no ‘domino effect’ in relation to China and Pakistan.¹⁰⁴

The US denied that its partnership with India was directed against any specific country or region, although a number of scholars believed that the US was developing its strategic relationship with India because it had China in mind and that India had the similar objective.¹⁰⁵ The US was still following the policy of looking for allies and friends that could be helpful in promoting its interests, and viewed India as an emerging international partner in dealing with a future Chinese threat.¹⁰⁶

Many politicians in the US criticised the deal, saying that signing the deal meant punching a gaping hole into the non-proliferation regime. The nuclear lobby group had opposed any deal since the 2005 framework, and tried hard to resist it. When they failed to stop the move, they changed their strategy and campaigned against the deal within Congress. Only the very strong negotiation by the very capable negotiator Nicholas Burns saved the deal. But the nuclear lobby group tried their best to foil the agreement until it took its final shape in Congress. With the whole-hearted support, and the efforts made, by President Bush and Condoleezza Rice, the deal was finally signed but still awaited implementation.¹⁰⁷

It became crystal clear from the discussion that the deal was not only about nuclear energy for India, but it had a number of other motivations behind it. Firstly, since the 21st century was going to be an Asian century, where India would be one of the major powers along with China, Russia and Japan, it was strategically imperative for the US to have strengthened a partnership with India. Secondly, since the United States wished to take the Indo-US relationship to a higher plane, the deal was vital as the continuing technology controls placed on India would be a major stumbling block to achieving this goal.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁴Vandana Bhatia, ‘The US–India Nuclear Agreement: Revisiting the Debate’, *op. cit.*, p. 614.

¹⁰⁵Arvind Gupta and Sanjeev K. Shrivastav, ‘Evolution of US Rebalancing Strategy: Implications for India’ in S.D. Muni & Vivek Chadha (Eds), *Asian Strategic Review 2014: US Pivot and Asian Security*, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi, 2014, p. 16.

¹⁰⁶Annpurna Nautiyal, ‘Current Trends in India-U.S. Relations: Hopes for a Secure Future’, *Strategic Insights*, Volume V, Issue 4, April 2006, p. 6.

¹⁰⁷Hari Sud, *op.cit.*

¹⁰⁸Rajeswari Pillai Rajagopalan, ‘Indo-US Nuclear Deal: Implications for India and the Global N-Regime’, *IPCS Special Report*, No. 62, Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, New Delhi, December 2008, p. 6.

4.7.3 Critical Assessment of the Nuclear Deal

The Indo-US nuclear deal was the reality of the time as India needed to secure its energy and the US wanted to develop a strategic partnership with India. The deal benefited both nations. Observers in different corners of the world, however, evaluated the deal in different ways. No doubt this deal, like many others, has its negative and positive impacts on the international and regional sphere. The agreement helped the countries meet their energy demands in an efficient way but there always remained the danger that a future Indian administration would divert or redirect the civilian facilities to nuclear weapons development. Such innate danger could pose a potential threat to regional and international peace and security.¹⁰⁹

The US was subject to severe criticism because of the nuclear deal with India. Firstly, it was argued that the US was enacting a double-standard with regards to the NPT and its decision to favour India. The deal breached the obligations provided by the NPT, in that the US would transfer nuclear materials to India which was neither a signatory to the NPT nor an officially recognised nuclear state.¹¹⁰ Many critics criticised the US for getting India into the international nuclear regime through the back door, though this criticism itself was also the subject of criticism because Indian policy was always found to be consistent with the NPT. Iran was believed to have a nuclear weapons programme despite being a signatory to the NPT, while North Korea withdrew from the treaty when it decided to develop a nuclear weapons programme, but India remained consistent in regard to the NPT. India since the beginning refused to sign the NPT, saying it was discriminatory.

Secondly, the deal set a precedent for other countries such as Pakistan, Iran, Israel, and North Korea to ask for similar deals. Thirdly, there would be a demand from the Islamic world to have a similar deal with Pakistan as it was the only country in the Muslim world that possessed nuclear bombs. It would also naturally lead to a nuclear arms race in the South Asian region. Israel was believed to have cited the Indo-US deal in seeking

¹⁰⁹ Malik Qasim Mustafa, 'The Indo-US Nuclear Deal: An Overview of IAEA Safeguards and Nuclear Trade with NSG', *op. cit.*, p. 11.

¹¹⁰ David Burgess, *The Indo-US Civilian Nuclear Agreement: The Tangle of Political Pressures, Security Concerns and Economic Interests Loosely Bound by Law*, 2010, pp. 2-3.

changes to the NSG rules and regulations and in seeking help in constructing its first nuclear power plant in the Negev desert.¹¹¹

There is no denying that the deal opened new windows on to Indo-US cooperation, but simultaneously it posed a critical challenge to India's non-aligned character and its leadership in the NAM. It has perhaps undermined India's strong stance on the forum as a leading and founding member and probably caused India to lose its prominence within the movement.¹¹² Many political leaders (including former Prime Minister Atal Bihari Bajpayee, former Deputy Prime Minister L.K. Advani, former External Affairs Minister Yashwant Sinha, Bharat Karnad, Arun Shourie, and a number of parliamentarians¹¹³) claimed that the deal made India subservient to the United States by becoming a political pawn and losing its strategic sovereignty. The Hyde Act¹¹⁴ rules imposed on India also weakened India's strong position in the international arena as a large country. There was the possibility that the deal would escalate tensions between India and Pakistan significantly but this has not happened.¹¹⁵

The deal was very significant to India, as India fully understood that it could not play its expected role in the region and in the international sphere without having the US on its side. India believed that only the US could restrain Pakistan's adventurism and contain the increasing Chinese influence in the region.¹¹⁶ A strong bilateral tie was as important for the US as it was for India. Richard Boucher said: 'Our landmark nuclear deal expanding defence ties, and our consultations on developments in South Asia all testify to this'.¹¹⁷

Theoretically, the deal was not just between India and the United States but between India and NSG countries, and thus when the deal was approved by the US Congress,

¹¹¹Rajeswari Pillai Rajagopalan, 'Indo-US Nuclear Deal: Implications for India and the Global N-Regime', *op.cit.*, pp. 8-9.

¹¹²Sukla Sen, 'Indo-US Nuclear Deal: The Continuing Drift in India's Foreign Policy', *South Asia Citizens Web*, 20 September 2008, Ekta, Mumbai.

¹¹³Harsh V. Pant, *The US-India Nuclear Pact: Policy, Process and Great Power Politics*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2011, p. 80, and Jayshree Bajoria and Esther Pan, 'The U.S.-India Nuclear Deal', *Council on Foreign Relations*, November 5, 2010.

¹¹⁴The Hyde Act is an act to regulate the US Atomic Energy, passed by the US Congress in December 2006. Although it was a domestic law, it provided the Bush administration with initial approval of the US Nuclear Deal with India. It provided certain waivers to India from various requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. It was considered humiliating for India because it required India to obey US domestic laws, in contrast to parallel deals with China and Japan which required no such subservience.

¹¹⁵Interview with Ambassador Anthony Quainton in Washington DC, 4 December 2012.

¹¹⁶Harunur Rashid, 'Hillary goes to India', *The Daily Star*, Dhaka, July 23, 2009.

¹¹⁷Telephone Interview with Richard Boucher from Paris on 30 November 2012.

India signed nuclear cooperation deals with Russia, Canada and France as well.¹¹⁸ In fact, the deal was the logical conclusion of desired Indo-US relations as framed by President Bush and Prime Minister Singh. It was a great opportunity for India to come out from a regional theatre to the high-table as a major world power, and thereby shape the Asian security contour and play its role in international sphere.¹¹⁹ Finally, this deal was a lasting incentive for India to refrain from any future nuclear tests, and to work with the US in stopping proliferation.

4.8 Conclusion

President George W. Bush left office as one of the most controversial presidents in US modern history. He was known as the ‘war president’ and was highly divisive.¹²⁰ He left a number of legacies for his successor, including the Iraq and Afghan wars, which I will discuss in the next chapters. During his two terms, the United States lost legitimacy in the international sphere because of unilateral actions.¹²¹ Bush was not interested in consensus in the international agenda and became very unpopular at home and abroad.

Although the United States under the Bush Administration failed to earn a strong reputation in the international arena, it made a success story in developing Indo-US relations. No one could have imagined that the Bush Administration was destined to have such a strong impact on Indo-US relations, though Condoleezza Rice had said it was the US’s intention to develop a new kind of relationship with India and change the terms of Indo-US engagement. The Bush Administration introduced the policy of de-hyphenation and successfully delinked India and Pakistan in its foreign policy.¹²²

In fact, the Indo-US relationship was positive right from India’s second nuclear test in 1998, though the US imposed sanction immediately after the test. Simultaneously, the US was seeking a strategic partnership with India which was subject to severe criticism in India, with critics arguing that a close relationship with the US was impossible while the US was imposing sanctions on India. The Bush Administration in his first term gave

¹¹⁸Prashant Hosur, ‘The Indo-US Civilian Nuclear Agreement: What’s the Big Deal?’ *op. cit.*, p. 446.

¹¹⁹Rajeswari Pillai Rajagopalan, ‘Indo-US Nuclear Deal: Implications for India and the Global N-Regime’, *op. cit.*, p. 10

¹²⁰Christopher H. Foreman Jr., ‘The Breaking of the President: Shifting Context and the Bush Domestic Agenda’ in Colin Campbell, Bert A. Rockman and Andrew Rudalevige (Eds), *The George W. Bush Legacy*, CQ Press, Washington DC, 2008, p. 265.

¹²¹Ilan Peleg, *The Legacy of George W. Bush’s Foreign Policy: Moving Beyond Neo-conservatism*, Westview Press, Colorado, United States, 2009, p. 15.

¹²²Condoleezza Rice, *No Higher Honour: A Memoir of My Years in Washington*, Simon & Schuster, London, 2011, p. 436.

up this kind of approach and took an entirely opposite policy by the end his second term, lifting restrictions on nuclear trade and finally making the unprecedented nuclear deal with India.¹²³ This time, the US was subject to criticism, and India was dubious about real US intentions until the nuclear deal was finally signed. Gopalkrisnan, the ex-Chairman of the Indian Atomic Energy Regulatory Board, said that ‘Americans cannot be trusted’ and labelled his colleagues who went along with them as ‘*stupid analysts*’.¹²⁴

Indo-US relations under the Bush Administration reached at an all-time high. The two countries became engaged on greater levels of cooperation in a wide range of fields including the economy, strategy, diplomatic spheres, defence supplies, agriculture, people-to-people contact, student exchanges and of course the nuclear deal.¹²⁵ Bilateral relations between them appeared to be promising particularly after the 2005 decision of the Bush Administration to pursue an energy deal with India, facilitating and easing improved Indo-US relations.¹²⁶ President Bush summed up the Indo-US relationship in this way, ‘India and the United States are separated by half the globe. Yet, today our two nations are closer than ever before’.¹²⁷

Although the Indo-US relations improved in many different areas, the nuclear agreement was the centrepiece of their relationships. It provided a fundamentally different base for improving the relationship. This deal rewrote the rules and regulations of the global nuclear regime and the Bush Administration modified the previous US policy by acknowledging India as a responsible nuclear state.¹²⁸ The deal was a ‘sweetheart’ deal for India. It was a paradigm shift in US policy toward India which ended 60 years of resentment and misunderstanding.¹²⁹ It benefitted both states immensely, and put Indo-US relations in a unique position.

Progress was undeniable in the Bush years but continuing progress could never be guaranteed and the question remained, as ever with a change of administration, whether

¹²³ Evan A. Feigenbaum, ‘India's Rise, America's Interest: The Fate of the U.S.-Indian Partnership’, *op.cit.* p. 79.

¹²⁴ Harold A. Gould, *The South Asia Story: The First Sixty Years of US Relations with India and Pakistan*, Sage Publications, 2011, p. 104.

¹²⁵ Interview with Ambassador Howard Schaffer in Washington DC, 5 December 2012.

¹²⁶ Interview with Professor Mike Green in Washington DC, 7 December 2012.

¹²⁷ President, Indian Prime Minister Singh Exchange Toasts, The State Dining Room, Washington, DC July 18, 2005, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/p/sca/rls/rm/2005/49766.htm> accessed on 2 November 2015.

¹²⁸ Ashton B. Carter, ‘America's New Strategic Partner?’ *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2006, p.33.

¹²⁹ Harold A. Gould, *The South Asia Story: The First Sixty Years of US Relations with India and Pakistan*, Sage Publications, 2011, pp. 104-5.

a new president would seek, as so many before had done, to reverse his predecessor's policies. The specifics of the US relationship with India would depend not only on factors relating to the two countries' characteristics but also on the broader evolution of the international system and the grand strategy of the new president in adapting the US role in the world to it. An understanding of the conceptual thinking of the new Obama administration is therefore essential precursor to consideration of development of the bilateral relationship and the following chapter addresses that thinking.

CHAPTER – FIVE

The Obama Administration: Conceptual Thinking behind the Policy

5.1 Introduction

Barack Obama took office in 2009 with a promise of change and to be different from his predecessors, something that almost all presidents promise do. The distinctiveness of Obama lay in his desire to imbue ‘hope’ into his idea of ‘change’.¹ It was widely perceived in peoples’ mind at home and abroad from Obama’s speeches and messages during his campaign that his messages of hope and optimism would replace the politics of fear that had guided American foreign policy since the horrific assaults of September 11. The election of Obama as the US president provided an opportunity to reshape the US’s controversial, unsettled, and unpopular policies pursued by the Bush Administration. The sense of anticipation was strong and was heard by other countries as Obama was greeted by a wave of great enthusiasm worldwide.²

Before taking the presidency, Obama had little time to concentrate on international affairs and hardly made any comments on international issues except the Iraq war.³ But after assuming office he initiated a highly ambitious drive to redefine US views on the changed world of the 21st century, and attempted to reconnect US policy the unfolding contemporary context.⁴ Obama assumed office at a difficult time, facing intimidating domestic and foreign crises and he tried to set a new course in meeting the crises and map a new picture in his foreign policy. He once said: ‘I am inheriting a world that could blow up any minute in half a dozen ways, and I will have some powerful but limited and perhaps even dubious tools to keep it from happening’.⁵

The most important goal of Obama’s foreign policy was to restore US moral supremacy and legitimacy, which President Bush had lacked. During Obama’s presidential

¹ Stephen Sestanovich, *Maximalist: America in the World from Truman to Obama*, Vintage Books, New York, 2014, pp. 302-3.

² John Davis, *Barack Obama & US Foreign Policy: Road Map For Change or Disaster*, Author House, Indiana, 2009, p. vii.

³ Zaki Laidi, *Limited Achievements: Obama’s Foreign Policy*, Palgrave MacMillan, New York, 2012, p. 15.

⁴ Zbigniew Brzezinski, ‘From Hope to Audacity: Appraising Obama’s Foreign Policy’, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 89, No. 1 (January/February), 2010, p. 16.

⁵ Bob Woodward, *Obama’s War*, Simon and Schuster, London, 2010, p. 11.

campaign, he repeatedly said that he would put immense emphasis on multilateralism in his foreign policy, in contrast to his predecessor.⁶ Obama wanted to reshape the government, and declared as much, with political slogans such as ‘Change We Can Believe In’ and ‘Yes, We Can!’⁷ His promise to shut the Guantanamo Bay, investigate the interrogation methods undertaken by the CIA, and stop the torture during the interrogations were a few steps in meeting the hopes of national and international public opinion.⁸

President Obama set out his vision through his rhetoric and actions, which drew a clear contrast between realism and pragmatism and inspired the reappearance of a more enlightened America on the world stage.⁹ The purpose of the current chapter is to depict Obama’s conceptual thinking on foreign policy and how he tried to be different from his predecessor in shaping the world with his ideas and principles, starting with an analysis of the challenges Obama faced on the eve of taking the presidency.

5.2 The Environment/Challenges Facing Obama in 2008

During Obama’s presidential campaign, and as president-elect in 2008, the US faced the deepest economic recession since the great depression of the 1930s. It is clear from US history that almost no president entered into office without inheriting a conflict, and Obama was no exception. The challenge he faced that the US was waging two major wars – Iraq and Afghanistan. Other major challenges posed were the ongoing War on Terror, issues surrounding Iran, North Korea, future relations with Russia, policy toward China, the peace process in the Middle East, climate change, energy, and disease.¹⁰

The American people had become exhausted with the two terms of the Bush Administration, and expected that Obama would transform US policy. Obama’s campaign rhetoric excited the US public, and gave hope at home and abroad. During

⁶ Kenneth R. Weinstein, *Perspective for the New Administration: Global Challenges for the Obama Administration*, Hudson Institute, Washington, p. 1.

⁷ Andrew J. Dowdle, Dirk C. Van Raemdonck and Robert Maranto, ‘Barack Obama: A Reagan of the left’ in Andrew J. Dowdle, Dirk C. Van Raemdonck and Robert Maranto (eds.), *The Obama Presidency: Change and Continuity*, Routledge, New York and London, 2011, p. 6.

⁸ Robert Onderjcsak, *American Foreign and Security Policy under Barack Obama: Change and Continuity*, P.5

⁹ Fawaz A. Gerges, ‘The Obama Approach to the Middle East: the End of America’s Moment?’, *International Affairs*, Vol. 89, No. 2, 2013, p. 301.

¹⁰ Miller Center of Public Affairs, University of Virginia. ‘Barack Obama’, Accessed November 24, 2015 available at <http://millercenter.org/president/essays-list/obama>.

campaign, Obama said: ‘I truly believe that the day I’m inaugurated, not only will the country look at itself differently, but the world will look at America differently’.¹¹ For Obama, President Bush was not able to realise how the changed international political scenario and globalisation had remade and reset global political systems. He understood how international political power was not concentrated on any particular centre or group, but rather it has become diffused, generating many new kinds of problems. To address such problems, the US could not do it alone; it needed allies, partners and friends to achieve its goals and interests.¹²

5.2.1 Bush’s Legacy: Obama’s War (Afghan and Iraq)

The incoming Obama Administration faced difficult challenges, some of which were unimaginable at the time of President Bush’s inauguration in 2001. As noted above, throughout US history the incumbent executive has almost always inherited a conflict from their predecessor, a phenomenon that has become more evident after World War II with the increasing US involvement in international affairs. In line with this long historical legacy, Barack Obama inherited two inconclusive wars – Afghan and Iraq. Historically, presidents who assume office in the middle of a conflict become either successors or innovators, depending on their role in the conflict. A successor is someone who continues the same policies and military strategy of his predecessor, while an innovator is someone who tries to adopt new policies and make a dramatic change in tactics and strategies. With regard to the Iraq war, Obama became a successor, following his predecessor’s approach, while in the Afghan war, he generally became an innovator, though with some elements of being a successor.¹³

On 29 November 2009, the National Security Adviser released a ‘Memorandum of Principles’ regarding the Afghanistan and Pakistan strategy. The document said that the US goal in Afghanistan was to deny safe haven to Al Qaeda, and the US, along with the people of Afghanistan and other international partners, would endeavour to defeat the Taliban insurgency, and build Afghan capacities to secure their country and govern

¹¹ James M. Lindsay, ‘George W. Bush, Barack Obama and the Future of US Global Leadership’, *International Affairs*, Vol. 87, Issue. 4, 2011, p. 773.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 765.

¹³Tom Lansford and Jack Covarrubias, ‘Inherited Wars’ in Robert P. Watson, Jack Covarrubias, Tom Lansford et. al. (Ed.), *The Obama Presidency: A Preliminary Assessment*, Suny Press, The State University of New York, 2012, pp. 231, 233-4.

themselves, thus creating the condition for the US to reduce its forces starting by July 2011.¹⁴

From the very beginning, Obama viewed the two wars differently, seeing the Afghan war as a war of necessity and the Iraq war as a war of choice. During his senate campaign debate against Alan Keyes Obama made the following statement on October 12, 2004: 'I have always thought that we did the right thing in Afghanistan. My only concern with respect to Afghanistan was that we diverted our attention from Afghanistan in terms of moving into Iraq and I think we would have done a better job stabilizing that country than we have in providing assistance to the Afghani people'.¹⁵

On 3 June 2007, in another debate at Saint Anselm College, Obama expressed the importance of the war in Afghanistan to defeating and eliminating the future threats of terror against the US. He emphasised the importance of focusing on the Afghan war to root out Al Qaeda, and argued that failing to do so would be inviting another terror attack on US soil. On 4 May 2008, in an interview with NBC, Obama said the US needed more troops in Afghanistan and needed to concentrate on reconstructing Afghanistan, as Al Qaeda had become stronger since 9/11, and was growing in capability. He also said that his administration would be more focussed on Afghanistan once he was elected as president.¹⁶ His emphasis on Afghanistan became clearer when he visited Afghanistan in July 2008 in his first foreign tour as candidate. During the visit, he described the situation as urgent, and argued it needed to be a central focus of US policy. He did not hesitate to go further, and argue the biggest mistake of the US was not to finish the job in Afghanistan.

When Obama came to power, he said that Afghanistan would be given priority as he had promised during his campaign.¹⁷ His administration undertook a reassessment of US policy toward Afghanistan twice. The first time was in March 2009, when additional troops were sent, and the second was in autumn of the same year. At the same time, however, Obama realised that military efforts alone were not going to be enough, and no political solution was possible without the Taliban. The Obama Administration should also be credited with the fact that, from the beginning, they understood that the

¹⁴ Bob Woodward, *Obama's War*, op. cit., pp. 385-6.

¹⁵ Lisa Rogak (Compiled), *Barack Obama in His Own Words*, JR Books, UK, 2009, p.5.

¹⁶ John Davis, *Barack Obama and US Foreign Policy: Roadmap for Change or Disaster?*, op. cit., p. 74.

¹⁷ Bob Woodward, *Obama's War*, op.cit., p. 24.

fates of Afghanistan and Pakistan were interrelated¹⁸ and therefore he said: 'I want to get Afghanistan and Pakistan right'.¹⁹

Obama had opposed the Iraq war from the beginning and called it a war of choice. During his campaign he reiterated his strong opposition to the war, which by then had turned into a bloody civil war. Obama consistently maintained that the Iraq war was a distraction from the main concern of Afghanistan, and must be brought to an end. In an article for *Foreign Affairs* titled 'To Renew American leadership in the World,' Obama wrote that since the Iraq war was a diversion from the fight against the perpetrators who were responsible for 9/11, it must be brought to a responsible end so the US can refocus attention on the broader Middle East. He also said that the US should not impose a military solution on an on-going civil war between two religious sects, but rather the US military should leave the country, put pressure on the conflicting groups to reach a lasting political solution, and declare openly that the US does not seek a permanent base on their soil.²⁰

After coming into office, President Obama requested a thorough assessment of US policy in Iraq and less than a month later, he announced its conclusions, demonstrating a realist assessment. The Obama Administration clearly showed its reluctance to expand US involvement, and declared the need for a total withdrawal by December 2011,²¹ although the actual withdrawal was delayed as it required a series of consultations with military personnel and had to consider Iraqi security questions and political issues.²²

Obama's approach to Iraq War was not directed by a single factor. It was the result of a combination of his principles of multilateralism, his view on Islam and the need to mitigate the anger of the Muslim world. The US relative decline of power which meant that the US was not in a position to win the war was a motivating factor of Obama's approach to the Iraq War.

Apart from the economic recession and two major wars, President Obama inherited a number of other legacies. He inherited persistent and extremely important conflicts in the Middle East – specifically the Israeli-Palestinian conflict – on which there had been

¹⁸Zaki Laidi, *op. cit.*, pp. 94, 97.

¹⁹Bob Woodward, *Obama's War*, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

²⁰Barack Obama, 'Renewing American Leadership', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 86, No. 4, pp.4-5.

²¹Zaki Laidi, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

²²Andrew J. Dowdle, Dirk C. Van Raemdonck and Robert Maranto (ed.), *The Obama Presidency: Change and Continuity*, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

very little progress, nuclear conflicts with Iran and North Korea, the increasingly hostile attitude of the Muslim world toward the US, and an ambiguous relationship with Russia. These were coupled with the distrust many Americans felt toward most multilateral initiatives which the country had committed to, such as on climate change and disarmament.²³

5.2.2 US Decline

US decline has been widely discussed, though the idea is not a new phenomenon, indeed it has been an abiding concern and a source of recurrent academic discussion at intervals since the early days of the Cold War. At the beginning of the Century Michael Cox was moved to ask why we need to discuss decline again. His answer was derived, first, from international relations theory, which suggested that every imperial or hegemonic system had built in contradictions that gave it a limited lifespan.²⁴ Paul Kennedy's concept of 'Imperial Overstretch' had articulated this perspective in the 1970s. The other factor was the factual evidence that the dominance the US had enjoyed at the end of the 20th century was being reduced, whether measured by military power, economic prosperity, moral legitimacy or more nebulous factors such as will to power. This left open the question of whether decline was absolute or relative. The latter was easier to demonstrate because the bar was lower in that US power, strengths and capacities only had to decrease relative to other powers whose capacities across the spectrum of international capability were rising.

Military defeat of the dominant power or some other apocalyptic incident was not necessary for the decline thesis to hold. It was more likely to be a gradual process, imperceptible for a time until some incident or event made it evident. It is more likely to occur when other players in the international system start using the rules of the international order set by the hegemon more effectively than their creator, or, in more extreme cases, another power supplants the hegemon by developing a new set of rules for international engagement and becoming dominant itself.²⁵

By the time Obama's presidency was imminent Cox's view was that, although the US was in trouble, due to failures in Iraq and Afghanistan abroad and slow economic

²³Zaki Laidi, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-4

²⁴Michael Cox, 'Is the United States in decline—again? An essay', *International Affairs*, Vol.83, No. 4, 2007, P, 645

²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 651.

growth at home it was not about to fall from its hegemonic perch.²⁶ America's position was not remotely as weak as Britain's after the World War II. Like many others, he accepted that the idea of relative decline was compatible with continuing vitality in economic size, military strength, and soft power.²⁷ The key was not some inherent weakness in the US but what Zakaria in 2009, at the beginning of the Obama era and at a time when the decline debate was again getting into full swing, termed, 'the rise of the rest'.²⁸ Leaving aside whether decline was a useful or misleading²⁹ word to describe what was happening, the idea that there was a power shift in the international system away from the West continued to gain currency in Obama's first term.³⁰ Adam Quinn quoted Mahbubani in the latter's article in *Foreign Affairs* saying that power was moving from West to East, not because of the result of the weakness of the West but the increasingly growing capacities of the countries of Asia. Mahbubhani argued that the US was losing some of its power to influence or affect others and this will continue in the future, and so its influence will be less in the years to come than it enjoyed in the past.³¹

Joseph Nye later countered this by arguing that 'decline' was a psychological notion whose greatest risk was that it might become self-fulfilling. This anxiety was cyclical: when in 1957 the Soviet Union launched Sputnik, people started saying that America was finished; in 1973, during the oil embargo, people again said that it was the end of America, as they did when the lessons of defeat in Vietnam were absorbed; in the 1980s, during the Reagan period when America went through an economic transition, people saw America fading before the economic challenge of Japan; and, in 1985 when the dollar was facing challenges and the European Union was emerging as a potential superpower, talk of American decline raised its head yet again. Interestingly, in early 2000, many people believed that America could do anything anywhere in the world, but by 2008 with the financial crisis in full swing people started saying again the end of

²⁶Michael Cox, 'Still the American Empire', *Political Studies Review*, Vol. 5, 2007, p. 1

²⁷ Barry Buzan and Michael Cox, 'China and the US: Comparable Cases of 'Peaceful Rise'?', *The Chinese Journal of International Politics*, Vol. 6, 2013, p.131.

²⁸ Fareed Zakaria, *The Post-American World And the Rise of the Rest*, Penguin Books, 2009, p. 1.

²⁹ Susan Strange argued that talking of US decline was not only misleading but a dangerous myth, See Michael Cox, 'September 11th and U.S. Hegemony—Or Will the 21st Century Be American Too?' *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 3, 2002, p. 57.

³⁰Michael Cox, Power Shifts, Economic Change and the Decline of the West?, *International Relations*, Vol. 26, No. 4, 2012, p. 369.

³¹ Adam Quinn, 'The Art of Declining Politely: Obama's Prudent Presidency and the Waning of American Power', *International Affairs*, Vol. 87, Issue, 4, July 2011, p.805.

American hegemony had arrived. Nye firmly believes that the US is not in absolute decline but its hegemony is simply a decrease relative to the rise of others.³² But by end of Obama's first term Cox was arguing that, although relative, this time the decline was 'real', not just a psychological, anxiety-driven construct.³³

Returning to the period of Obama's election, Robert Kagan argued that the world was still 'unipolar', with the US remaining the only superpower but that a struggle for power and influence had returned as key characteristics in the international system³⁴. It was also important not to juxtapose this position with a view of the past that exaggerated US influence. Losing China to communism, invasion of South Korea by North Korea, testing of Hydrogen bomb by the USSR, defeat in Vietnam were examples in the second half of the 20th century where the United States could not manage events.³⁵ Wallerstein argued that America had been a declining hegemonic power since the 1970s, and its response to the terrorist attacks on US soil has simply accelerated this decline. He argued that the main objective of US foreign policy, from Nixon to Clinton, was to slow down its decline, and for this, they all followed the policy of 'soft multilateralism'.³⁶ For him, it should not be a question whether the United States was declining, rather it should be whether it can adopt policies to manage the speed of its descent leaving minimum damage to itself and to the world.³⁷

Although Wallerstein was writing from a critical left wing stance his perspective was shared by the neo-conservative intellectual driving force behind the Bush administration who called for a break with soft multilateralism. For them American decline did not emanate from structural change in the international system but from weak leadership. They favoured 'unilateral' stand to restore US hegemonic power through an unrestrained demonstration of military strength.³⁸ This idea that a foreign policy based on multilateralism was nothing more a mechanism for the management of US Decline was an accusation that would be raised again and be levied at Obama, as we shall see.

³² Joseph S. Nye Jr, *Is the American Century Over?*, Polity Press, 2015, p.23.

³³ Michael Cox, *op. cit.*, p. 373.

³⁴ Robert Kagan, End of Dreams, Return of History, *Policy Review*, 144, August-September, 2007, p. 18.

³⁵ Robert Kagan, 'The September 12 Paradigm: America, the World, and George W. Bush', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 87, Issue. 5, (Sep/Oct 2008), p. 38.

³⁶ Immanuel Wallerstein, 'The Decline of U.S. Power', *Contexts*, Spring 2005, p. 25.

³⁷ Immanuel Wallerstein, 'The Eagle Has Crash Landed', *Foreign Policy*, No. 131 (Jul. - Aug., 2002), p. 66.

³⁸ Immanuel Wallerstein, 'The Decline of U.S. Power', *Contexts*, Spring 2005, p. 25.

We should also note that the US's own intelligence assessment predicted that America will be less dominant by 2025.³⁹ Whether it would be replaced by another hegemonic power, presumably China was an open question, since China faced many challenges itself, as was the length of time such a transition would take.⁴⁰ The question of American decline increasingly took on a Chinese focus and reassessments of the relative strengths and weaknesses of the US and China.⁴¹ If the argument is that fundamental strength comes from the internal organisation of society and democracy, the rule of law, liberty, equality, freedom of expression, and popular sovereignty, are the strongest basis, then China will be found wanting.⁴² But perhaps the most important sign of the continuing strength of the US is that people across the world still want to be American and very few aspire to become Chinese. Brooks and Wohlforth, like many analysts who believed US was not in an absolute decline, argued that America will not be 'replaced as the sole superpower for a very long time' and they were confident of sustainability of the US lead for many more years.⁴³

The Obama Administration pointed to the real difference between the American position in international sphere with that it occupied in the mid-1990s when talking about US decline in the 1990s sounded slightly an absurd. The rise of China economically and militarily, and its aspiration and potential to fight for its interests in the international arena, challenged US hegemony. US economic leadership is being challenged by key BRIC rivals and economically strong states like Germany are overtaking the US as an industrial exporter.⁴⁴

Whatever the niceties of the academic debate Obama came to power when the rise of China was beginning to challenge US hegemony, its economic ascendancy was being threatened by rapid growth in the BRIC countries and other emerging powers, and by allies like Germany. President Bush came to recognise these trends and President Obama recognised even more clearly that America had limited resources to meet the

³⁹ Adam Quinn, *op.cit.*, p.807.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp.808-9.

⁴¹ Robert Sutter, 'The Obama Administration and US Policy in Asia', *Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs*, Vol. 31, No. 2, August 2009, p. 193.

⁴² Robert J. Lieber, 'America in Decline? It's a Matter of Choices, Not Fate' *World Affairs*, Vol. 175, No. 3, 2012, p. 90.

⁴³ Adam Quinn, *op.cit.*, p.808.

⁴⁴ Bryan Mabee, *Understanding American Power: The Changing World of US Foreign Policy*, Palgrave Macmillan, UK, 2013, pp. 49, 151.

requirements of the sole superpower status.⁴⁵ It therefore became his task to reformulate US global leadership in a world of US relative decline. His path was evident from many early policy choices. He avoided confrontation in dealings with major powers like China and Russia believing in particular that Chinese power and influence was something to be managed not confronted. He sought to de-escalate the US confrontation with Iran and sought constructive ties both with it and with the Muslim world at large. In addition the decision was made to try and to encourage others countries to step up and share the burdens of global governance.⁴⁶ Consequently, Obama became a leading advocate of replacing the G8 with the G20, and of increasing the presence of rising economies in the multilateral economic forum.⁴⁷

Facing a context of relative decline, Obama judged that the United States either had to adjust to the changed new post hegemonic world where it would remain no longer the pre-eminent power, or to resist these trends and risk faster decline by confronting the inevitable.⁴⁸ He was well suited a policy of what his critics termed ‘managed decline’ but which he saw as maximising US influence in a changed world by minimising conflicts and avoiding confrontations, or as one commentator put it, mastering the art of declining politely.⁴⁹

One implication was clear: if Obama’s strategy was to work, emerging powers would have to be seen as potential partners in maintaining the liberal international order, rather than enemies seeking to overthrow it. As the leader of that order it was incumbent on the US create partnerships and of the candidates among the emerging powers who were best suited for this role, India was at the head of the queue⁵⁰.

5.3 Obama’s Foreign Policy - Views and Vision

Since Obama did not develop clear guidelines on foreign policy that could warrant the name of an ‘Obama Doctrine’, unlike most of his predecessors, it is not easy to define his foreign policy precisely. Professor Stephen Cohen praised Obama for not having developed a doctrine, whereas others have considered it evidence of his lack of foreign

⁴⁵Kristian L. Nielsen, ‘Continued drift, but without the acrimony: US-European relations under Barack Obama’, *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, Vol.11, No. 1, 2013, p. 91.

⁴⁶Bryan Mabee, *op.cit.*, pp. 50-51.

⁴⁷Kristian L. Nielsen, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

⁴⁸Michael Cox, ‘Is the United States in decline—again? An essay’, *International Affairs*, Vol.83, No. 4, 2007, P, 645.

⁴⁹Adam Quinn, *op.cit.*, pp.822-4.

⁵⁰Interview with Thomas Lynch in Washington DC, December 5, 2012.

policy vision. As a non-doctrinaire kind of president, Obama had the opportunity to be flexible in dealing with new issues.⁵¹

Upon taking the presidency, Obama ushered in a new global order and based his foreign policy on three pillars, the first of which was the need for a changed relationship with emerging powers in Asia and particularly China. The second pillar was nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, and third was a transformed relationship between the United States and the Muslim world, turning Islamic countries into positive partners and replacing conflict with cooperation.⁵²

The United States was being blamed for the global financial crisis by the people of the most economically developed countries, especially in Western Europe⁵³, and was severely criticised for the Iraq war conducted in the name of the War on Terror. So it became an important objective of the Obama Administration to regain and refurbish the US image abroad. Another important aspect of Obama's foreign policy focus was his emphasis on diplomacy, and his use of soft power over military power. During his campaign, he made it clear that he would look to open a dialogue with those countries generally hostile to US policy. He said: 'I do think that it's important for the US not just to talk to its friends, but also to talk to its enemies'.⁵⁴ In his inaugural address, he showed a significantly different approach from that of his predecessor to international affairs. He said: 'to all other peoples and governments who are watching today, from the grandest capitals to the small village where my father was born: know that America is a friend of each nation and every man, woman, and child who seeks a future of peace and dignity, and that we are ready to lead once more'.⁵⁵

Obama's foreign policy objective was not regime change in the name of democracy-promotion abroad.⁵⁶ His new approach to foreign policy was not based on a kind of abstract moral principle or on an absolute military force but was based on building a

⁵¹ Daniel S. Morey, Clayton L. Thyne, Sarah L. Hayden & Michael B. Sinters, 'Leader, Follower, or Spectator? The Role of President Obama in the Arab Spring Uprising', *Social Science Quarterly*, Volume 93, Number 5, December 2012, pp.1187-88.

⁵² Martin S. Indyk, Kenneth G. Lieberthal, and Michael E. O' Hanlon, 'Scoring Obama's Foreign Policy: A Progressive Pragmatist Tries to bend History', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 91, No. 3, 2012, p.32.

⁵³ Pew Global Attitudes Project, 'Global Public Opinion in the Bush Years (2001-2008)', available at <http://www.pewglobal.org/files/pdf/263.pdf> accessed 28 November 2015.

⁵⁴ Daniel S. Morey, Clayton L. Thyne, Sarah L. Hayden & Michael B. Sinters, *op. cit.*, p.1189.

⁵⁵ Barack Obama, Inaugural Address, January 20, 2009, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/obama/speeches/speech-4453>, accessed 28 November 2015.

⁵⁶ Martin S. Indyk, Kenneth G. Lieberthal, and Michael E. O'Hanlon, *Bending History: Barack Obama's Foreign Policy*, Brookings Institution Press, 2012, p. 15.

real kind of relationship with other nations based on shared and common interests.⁵⁷ With this in mind I will now look in more detail at the main principles of Obama's foreign policy.

5.3.1 Multilateralism

Multilateralism means adopting a collective, coordinated and a unified approach or action to any international problem. It refers to a collective response among three or more states to a particular situation of conflict or confrontation, instead of acting alone. Ikenberry defined multilateralism as it 'involves the coordination of relations among three or more states according to a set of rules or principles'.⁵⁸ In other words, it is a commitment to acting in consultation with others where international institutions are regarded as vehicles in pursuing the goal. It is quite contrary to unilateralism, which refers to acting one country alone, no matter whether it is out of necessity or choice. Multilateralism and unilateralism are two opposite ends of a spectrum.⁵⁹

Multilateralism in US foreign policy has been a defining strategy since the Second World War, and was followed by every administration, whether Democrat or Republican. The US multilateral approach has been seen in many areas of international, either from NATO in military security or the WTO in trade policy. The Bush Administration proved an exception, and brought huge damage to the US on the international scene.⁶⁰ It is also important to note here that the Bush Administration did not simply abandon multilateralism,⁶¹ but rather was inclined to prefer 'minilateralism' over multilateralism, meaning he preferred to make a multilateral moves that were not necessarily authorised by international organisations. It is an operation under the direct guidance of a single country where participating countries have hardly any say or role in defining the priorities or objectives of the operation. It was a mix of unilateralism and multilateralism which could be regarded as more unilateral. In some cases, the Bush Administration pursued strategic multilateralism, not an ideological multilateralism, or not multilateralism in its real sense.

⁵⁷Fawaz A. Gerges, *op. cit.* p. 301.

⁵⁸G. John Ikenberry, 'Is American Multilateralism in Decline?', *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 1, No. 3, September 2003, p. 534.

⁵⁹Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, 'International Relations Theory and the Case against Unilateralism', *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 3, No. 3, p.509.

⁶⁰Michael Mastanduno, 'After Bush: A Return to Multilateralism in U. S. Foreign Policy?' *Nanzan Review of American Studies*, Vol. 30, 2008, pp. 33-34, 43.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, p. 42.

Obama's multilateral approach, however, was more in line with real multilateralism, meaning an operation must be authorised by an international institution or community, where each member has a clear and loud voice in determining and defining objectives and strategies in achieving the defined objectives.⁶² Obama said repeatedly during his campaign that his foreign policy would be characterised by a multilateral approach, and promised a re-engagement of the US with the world. Multilateralism, partnership in international relations, and common security interests became part and parcel of his pragmatic and realistic foreign policy.⁶³ Obama was of the opinion that diplomacy, not fear, was the only means with which to build such partnership and alliances. Obama said that 'We can neither retreat from the world nor try to bully it into submission. We must lead the world, by deed and example'.⁶⁴

On assuming the presidency, Obama actively tried to counter the negative image of the previous administration's unilateral actions. Obama's commitment to multilateralism was demonstrated further in his address to a joint Congressional session in 2009. He said: 'a new era of engagement has begun. For we know that America cannot meet the threats of this century alone, but the world cannot meet them without America'.⁶⁵ Obama also said that there was a time, though those days are now over, that Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin could shape the world in one meeting. Addressing the UN General Assembly, President Obama said: 'Those who used to chastise America for acting alone in the world cannot now stand by and wait for America to solve the world's problems alone'.⁶⁶

Obama's strong stance on multilateralism was the result of the US invasion in Iraq in 2003 which was a 'coalition of the willing'. The main purpose of this multilateral approach was to make use of international institutions and involve the international community. When Obama came to office, the question was which institutions would

⁶² Daniel S. Morey, Clayton L. Thyne, Sarah L. Hayden & Michael B. Selters, *op. cit.*, pp.1189-90.

⁶³ Fawaz A. Gerges, *op. cit.* p. 302.

⁶⁴ Barack Obama, 'Renewing American Leadership', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 86, No. 4, 2007, p.4.

⁶⁵ Barack Obama, Address Before a Joint Session of Congress, February 24, 2009, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/obama/speeches/speech-4612> accessed 30 November 2015.

⁶⁶ John Lyman, 'Obama's Multilateralism', *International Policy Digest*, 27 March 2011, available at <http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2011/03/27/obamas-multilateralism/>, accessed 30 November 2015.

Obama prioritise, and with which powers would he work closely? The administration advocated a stronger United Nations, a global NATO, and network diplomacy.⁶⁷

Obama championed multilateralism for a number of reasons. The first and main reason was that Obama wanted to reverse the unilateralist policy of the Bush Administration which reduced US popularity in the world. The people of the United States wanted a clear change in foreign policy. Citizens were in favour of a fundamental redirection of US foreign policy from that of President Bush's unilateralism to multilateralism. The rise of China and India suggested a shift in the international system – a shift from unipolarity to multipolarity.⁶⁸ Obama also wanted to minimise the risk for the US when attempting to solve international problems. Finally, he firmly believed that multilateralism was key to the success of every president including Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy. They all were successful both in protecting their citizens and in expanding opportunity for the generations to come.⁶⁹

5.3.2 Non-proliferation – Tenets of Obama's Nuclear Policy

Barack Obama believed that the world should abolish nuclear weapons to make the world a safe and secure place to live. He sought to strengthen the NPT for this purpose. This was a combination of idealism and pragmatism based on American strategic considerations. Obama became the first US president since the Second World War who took the issue of nuclear elimination seriously and formulated US policy to reduce its reliance on nuclear weapons.⁷⁰

Unlike George Bush, 'rogue states' was not considered the foremost security threat by Obama, who instead considered the biggest security threat to be the risk that terrorists might acquire a crude nuclear device. Al Qaeda, for example, made clear that it would bring 'Hiroshima' to the US. Obama considered this a serious and urgent threat to the security not only of the US but of the entire world. The spread of nuclear devices, materials and technology to the hands of terrorists could bring more catastrophe than

⁶⁷Richard Gowan, 'The Obama Administration and Multilateralism: Europe Relegated', *FRIDE Policy Brief*, No. 39, February 2010, p.2.

⁶⁸Fawaz A. Gerges, *op. cit.*, p. 305.

⁶⁹John Davis, *Barack Obama and US Foreign Policy: Roadmap for Change or Disaster?*, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

⁷⁰Andrew Futter, 'The United States after Unipolarity: Obama's Nuclear Weapons Policy in a Changing World', *IDEAS reports - special reports*, Nicholas Kitchen (ed.), SR009, LSE IDEAS, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, 2011, p. 13.

9/11. Obama therefore recognised that the United States must confront this with its utmost consideration to renew its leadership in the world.⁷¹

Obama used different platforms to articulate his policy of nuclear non-proliferation. The official stance of the Obama Administration toward US nuclear policy was spelt out in his Prague speech in April 2009. He said that, the existence of thousands of nuclear weapons was the legacy of five decades of the Cold War. Although the Cold War was over, those weapons still existed and this increased the risk of nuclear attack, as more countries possessed those dangerous weapons and testing continued. He further said the chances of spreading the technology in making those weapons were very high; terrorists were committed to have one either by stealing or purchasing from the black market. In the speech, he declared that his aim was to secure all vulnerable nuclear materials, break up nuclear black markets, and detect and seize materials in transit across the borders. He said that the US was firmly committed to ensuring a secure and peaceful world without nuclear weapons. He also said that this lofty goal might not be achieved in his lifetime.⁷²

He criticised those who believed that the spreading of those weapons cannot be stopped or checked. If we were to bound to live in a world where spreading of nuclear weapons were regarded as inevitable, then one day we will admit that the use of such weapons would be inevitable. Obama said that the United States – the only nuclear power to have used a nuclear weapon – has a moral responsibility to act and take the initiative toward building a nuclear-free world, starting the initiative by reducing its existing nuclear stockpiles. He also said that ‘We cannot succeed in this endeavour alone, but we can lead it, we can start it’.⁷³

He also put forward the steps how to achieve that goal. Firstly, all countries including America should give up their reliance on nuclear weapons in their national security strategies. Secondly, to reduce nuclear stockpiles, the US would negotiate a new START with Russia. The reduction process was heralded by aiming to bring down the number of nuclear arsenals to 1500 to 1675 approximately on each side.⁷⁴ Thirdly, to

⁷¹ John Davis, *Barack Obama and US Foreign Policy: Roadmap for Change or Disaster?*, op. cit., p. 8.

⁷² Barack Obama, Speech delivered at Prague, April 5, 2009, available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-barack-obama-prague-delivered> accessed 30 November 2015.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ A. Vinod Kumar, ‘A Doctrine at Work: Obama’s Evolving Nuclear Policy and What it Bodes for India’, *Strategic Analysis*, Vol. 35, No. 2, March 2011, p. 209.

stop testing, the Obama Administration would pursue US ratification of the CTBT. Fourthly, all nations together should strengthen the NPT as a basis for cooperation. And finally, in strengthening the cooperation in gaining the desired goal, rules must be binding, and those that leave the treaty and violate the rules must be punished.⁷⁵ President Obama's bold stance and steps were recognised and rewarded by the Nobel Peace Prize.

Obama said that we should also ensure that nations cannot build nuclear weapons programme under the name of developing nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. No doubt, Iran and North Korea were at the forefront of his mind. Obama was able to strengthen the commitment of the international community to his agenda of a nuclear-free world and countries pursuing nuclear weapons have faced growing isolation.⁷⁶

5.3.3 Counterterrorism

Obama treated terrorism in a different way to George Bush, who had damaged US image in, and its relations with, the Islamic world. Since the time of the campaign his argument was that Bush's approach to terrorism brought more harm than good to the US, and damaged US relations not only with the countries of the Muslim world but with its Western allies.⁷⁷ Obama argued that terrorism should be treated 'like a law enforcement problem' and the terrorists must be treated as common criminals who pose a particularly alarming threat.⁷⁸ So when he became president, Obama followed a strategy of countering terrorism that was quite opposite to the previous administration.

Firstly, the Obama Administration stopped using the phrase 'War on Terror', used and popularised by the Bush Administration.⁷⁹ The main purpose of abandoning this phrase was his desire to manage terrorism politically rather than ideologically. Obama preferred to refer to Al Qaeda instead of the War on Terror in fighting terrorism. He said: 'The United States is at war. We are at war against Al Qaeda and its terrorist

⁷⁵Barack Obama, Speech delivered at Prague, April 5, 2009, available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-barack-obama-prague-delivered> accessed 30 November 2015.

⁷⁶Martin S. Indyk, Kenneth G. Lieberthal, and Michael E. O'Hanlon, 'Scoring Obama's Foreign Policy: A Progressive Pragmatist Tries to Bend History', *op. cit.*, pp.40-1.

⁷⁷Mark N. Katz, *Leaving Without Losing: The War on Terror After Iraq and Afghanistan*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012, p. 42.

⁷⁸John Davis, *Barack Obama and US Foreign Policy: Roadmap for Change or Disaster?*, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

⁷⁹Jay Solomon, 'U.S. Drops 'War on Terror' Phrase, Clinton Says', *Wall Street Journal*, March 31, 2009, available at <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB123845123690371231> accessed 1st December 2015.

affiliates'.⁸⁰ John Brennan, an advisor to President Obama for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, explained 'Nor do we describe our enemy as "jihadist" or "Islamists" because jihad is a holy struggle, a legitimate tenet of Islam, meaning to purify oneself or one's community, and there is nothing holy or legitimate or Islamic about murdering innocent men, women, and children. Indeed, characterising our adversaries this way would actually be counterproductive'.⁸¹

The Obama Administration made it clear that the United States was not at war with Islam or Muslims but only with those radicals who terrorise and kill innocent people in the name of Islam.⁸² These so-called Islamists even killed thousands of Muslims. They could simply be called murderers. As it was Obama's view that the United States was at war with Al Qaeda, it was his first strategic decision to shift priority from Iraq to Afghanistan.⁸³ He said that the US must refocus and concentrate its efforts on Afghanistan and Pakistan so that the US was fighting terrorists where they originated and had the deepest roots.

Obama also said that, since terrorists operate globally, they must be faced globally. Rigorous efforts would be undertaken in South and Central Asia now. He promised to defeat Al Qaeda and uproot its base, arguing that there should not be any safe haven anywhere for those who kill Americans and innocent people. He further said: 'I will build a twenty-first-century military and twenty-first-century partnerships as strong as the anti-Communist alliance that won the Cold War to stay on the offense everywhere from Djibouti to Kandahar'.⁸⁴ He emphasised an integrated and comprehensive strategy to defeat the terrorists wherever they are, and that the US would utilise its utmost power.⁸⁵

⁸⁰Zaki Laidi, *op. cit.*, p. 66

⁸¹Remarks by Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism John Brennan at CSIS, May 26, 2010, available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-assistant-president-homeland-security-and-counterterrorism-john-brennan-csi> accessed 1st December 2015.

⁸²Mark N. Katz, *op.cit.*, p. 15.

⁸³Camille Grand, 'Obama's Foreign Policy: Is this Change We Can Believe In? European Perspective', European Security Forum, *ESF Working Paper*, No. 32, August 2009, p. 7.

⁸⁴Fred Hiatt, 'Stay-the-Course Plus', The Washington Post, June 4, 2007, available at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/03/AR2007060300951.html> , accessed 10 March 2016.

⁸⁵Barack Obama, 'Renewing American Leadership', pp. 9-11.

5.3.4 Relations with the Islamic World

Obama came to office at a time when the US was in the midst of two major wars with countries of the Islamic world, with a high troop presence in Iraq and a substantial number in Afghanistan. Israel had just invaded southern Lebanon, there was a massive deployment of Israeli forces in Gaza, and Israel had restarted the building of settlements in the West Bank.⁸⁶ It was one of major objectives of Obama's foreign policy to regain the US's damaged image and heal the rift that had emerged between the US and the Muslim world.

During his campaign, Obama made a number of statements about the beginning of a new era in US relations with the Islamic world, and tried to make clear before the world that he intended to reach a Middle East peace agreement and bring about an amicable settlement between Israel and Palestine. Obama pledged negotiations with Iran and a number of other states, without preconditions, though he later changed the language of his statements due to criticism that he was naïve. After assuming office, Obama shifted his foreign policy priorities away from the Middle East and toward the Pacific region.⁸⁷ Within a few months, however, Obama realised that the world was watching and waiting for him to make good on his campaign promises, so he had to do something to refurbish US relations with the Islamic world relatively quickly. Within five months of his presidency, therefore, he decided to deliver a speech about US relations with the Muslim world and chose the venue of Cairo University, which the White House stressed, was the heart of the Muslim world.⁸⁸

In his historic Cairo speech, Obama sincerely praised Islam, and recognised the contribution of Islam and Muslims to the development of civilisation and knowledge in various fields. He praised the basic tenets of Islam and the Holy Quran and said that Islam was not part of the problem in combating violence and extremism, but an important part of promoting peace.⁸⁹ The contents and messages of the speech had far-reaching implications. President Obama tried to articulate the basic beliefs and values of

⁸⁶Steve Clemons, 'The Middle East and North Africa' in Xenia Dormandy (Ed.), *The Next Chapter: President Obama's Second-Term Foreign Policy*, Chatham House, London, 2013, p. 42.

⁸⁷ John Davis, *Barack Obama and US Foreign Policy: Roadmap for Change or Disaster?*, *op. cit.*, pp.65-66.

⁸⁸ Joyce P. Kaufman, *A Concise History of US Foreign Policy*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2010, p.158.

⁸⁹Barack Obama, *Address at Cairo University*, June 4, 2009, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/obama/speeches/speech-5502>, accessed 3 December 2015.

the United States and explained that those were not in contrast with the values and beliefs of the rest of the world, nor even the Muslim world. He stressed very much that his administration would seek to spread those values without imposing them, as had been done by his predecessor, but would seek to pursue a new foreign policy. He very clearly said that: ‘I’ve come here to Cairo to seek a new beginning between the United States and Muslims around the world, one based on mutual interest and mutual respect and one based upon the truth that America and Islam are not exclusive and need not be in competition. Instead, they overlap and share common principles, principles of justice and progress, tolerance and the dignity of all human beings’.⁹⁰ Obama considered it a defining moment to re-engage with the Islamic world.

Obama recognized the evolving mistrust between the US and the Islamic world, and said it would not go away overnight. To bridge the gaps, Obama argued, the West and the Islamic world need to listen each other, learn from each other, and respect each other. He also said that Islam was a part of America in many ways and he recalled that Morocco, an Islamic country, was the first to recognize the US. He also reminded in his Ankara speech that: ‘America is not, and never will be, at war with Islam’. Regarding the Afghan and Iraq wars, he was very clear that the US was fighting in Afghanistan out of necessity and the US would not keep its troops there once Al Qaeda was defeated, and that the Iraq war was out of choice but that he had made it clear to the Iraqi people that the US would not pursue any base in Iraq and the US would withdraw all troops from Iraq by the end of 2012. He also said the US would support a united Iraq as a partner.⁹¹

Regarding Palestine, Obama said that: ‘America will not turn our backs on the legitimate Palestinian aspiration for dignity, opportunity, and a state of their own’. He also asserted, however, that the Palestinians should abandon the use of violence, which would never bring a solution or peace. At the same time, he also made it clear that Israel should freeze all settlement activities. In his speech, it was clear that the United States was ready to discuss any issue with Iran without any precondition except the nuclear issue, on which the US had a decisive point: Iran could pursue peaceful nuclear power only if it complied with its responsibilities under the NPT.⁹²

⁹⁰*Ibid.*

⁹¹*Ibid.*

⁹²*Ibid.*

President Obama made a clear distinction between the terrorists and Islamists. He believed those who attacked the US and killed innocent people were simply terrorists whether their names were Muslim or whether they came from an Islamic background. Islam is a religion of peace that never allows killing innocent men, women, and children. Quran says: ‘whoever kills an innocent’ –‘it is as if he has killed all mankind’ and it also says: ‘whoever saves a person; it is as if he has saved all mankind’. Obama believed that terrorists (in the name of Islam) killed more Muslims than all other faiths combined. So he considered his duty as President of the United States to fight against negative stereotypes of Islam wherever they appear.⁹³

5.3.5 Relations with Rising Powers

Obama’s attitude to the other rising powers was set by his view of America’s limitations, echoing, but not endorsing, the theme of decline. As I discussed above, Obama acknowledged US relative decline and acted accordingly, looking for friends and allies. In an interview with Fareed Zakaria, Obama was asked to describe the ‘Obama Doctrine’, and he replied ‘[Mine is] an American leadership that recognizes the rise of countries like China, India and Brazil. It’s a US leadership that recognizes our limits in terms of resources and capacity.’⁹⁴ Maintaining and improving good relations with other powers was not only directed by the fact that the United States needed trade with them but it was a policy of adaptation with the changed world, where countries were rising in terms of resources and capacities.

Professor Nye firmly believed that the decline of the United States would not be an easy process because its power is not based on colonies or empire, but rather on alliances and partnership and on informal networks, which cannot be diminished overnight, and are never a burden like colonies.⁹⁵ In line with Nye’s view, Obama said the American moment was not over but must be seized anew. He believed that, in facing security threats and enhancing security, it was necessary to build alliances and partnerships. He criticised US policies for sending wrong signals to its international partners. Having realised American relative decline, Obama insisted that he would rebuild and strengthen American relations and partnership with its allies in Europe, Asia, and throughout the

⁹³*Ibid.*

⁹⁴ Obama’s quote from Fareed Zakaria, ‘The Strategist’, 19 January 2012, available at <http://fareedzakaria.com/2012/01/19/the-strategist/>, accessed 5 December 2015.

⁹⁵ Joseph Nye, p. 115

Americas and Africa.⁹⁶ He even vowed to negotiate and engage with America's enemies, a plan that was outright rejected by his predecessor George Bush. He said, quoting Kennedy that 'we should never negotiate out of fear, but we should never fear to negotiate'.⁹⁷

Obama argued that, as the United States strengthened NATO, it should also emphasise making new alliances and partnerships in other parts of the globe. He believed, since China was rising, that South Korea and Japan were asserting themselves, and he would work to build an effective framework in Asia beyond bilateral agreements. The Six Party Talks on North Korea could be one such effort. He argued that US relations with rising China could be done two ways – competing with China in some areas and cooperating in others. He further said the US must orchestrate a fruitful cooperation and collaboration on important issues of global concern among major power states, including rising powers such as India, Brazil, South Africa, and even Nigeria. The United States should give them a stake in order to uphold international order and to that end, the UN would require reform.⁹⁸

As a candidate for president, Obama delivered a speech before a huge crowd in Berlin in July 2008, in which he acknowledged the mistakes made by the previous administration and promised that in the world of interdependence he would renew the US ties that had been damaged by the Bush Administration. He pledged to make cooperative and collaborative relations with Europe, tackling challenges of all kinds ranging from transnational terrorism to global climate change. After eight years of the Bush Administration, the Europeans were ready for a change in their relationship with the US, and European leaders welcomed Obama and became very eager to deal with the new administration.⁹⁹

The Obama Administration continued to give priority to its main allies in Asia such as Japan, South Korea and Australia, over other Asian powers such as China, India, and North Korea. Hillary Clinton's first visit and her first four stops to East Asia in February 2009 and Obama's meetings with Asian leaders, gave a clear indication that

⁹⁶ Barack Obama, 'Renewing American Leadership', *op. cit.* pp. 11-12.

⁹⁷ Fawaz A. Gerges, *op. cit.*, p. 301.

⁹⁸ Barack Obama, 'Renewing American Leadership', *op. cit.*, p.12.

⁹⁹ Kristian L. Nielsen, *op. cit.*, pp.83-4.

US relations with these rising nations would take a prominent place in Obama's foreign policy.¹⁰⁰

It is a fact that since the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia has been an issue in every presidential election in the US. In 2008 Democrats blamed the Bush administration for endangering US security by antagonising Putin without any clear reason. The Obama Administration announced a new policy in February 2009 at the Munich Security Conference where Vice-President Joe Biden said: 'It's time to press the reset button and to revisit the many areas where we can and should be working together with Russia'.¹⁰¹ Although the United States and Russia were not natural economic partners, the Obama Administration sought closer economic ties with Russia. The Russian president insisted that he would be willing to work with the US, and described President Obama as 'an honest person who really wants to change much for the better'.¹⁰² Putin also said that the cooperation on Afghanistan would continue and he also warned that the US should not withdraw from Afghanistan prematurely.¹⁰³

5.4 Obama's Pivot to Asia: India's Place in the Setting

At the end of the third year of Obama's first term, the US government issued a series of statements which indicated a shift in the US strategic focus. President Obama addressed the Australian Parliament on 17 November 2011, where he indicated a broader shift in US foreign policy to Asia popularly known as the 'pivot to Asia,' which was subsequently described as a rebalance. This policy of rebalancing involved a big change to the US military and diplomatic engagement with the Asia-Pacific.¹⁰⁴ Although President Obama is not generally considered to have developed any kind of doctrine, this pivot to Asia could qualify as the Obama Doctrine. Although this policy was declared in 2011, its seeds were sown during his presidential campaign. The Obama Administration saw the region as the fastest growing in the world and home of more

¹⁰⁰ Robert Sutter, 'The Obama Administration and US Policy in Asia', *op. cit.*, pp. 196-7.

¹⁰¹ Angela Stent, 'US-Russia Relations in the Second Obama Administration', *Survival*, Vol. 54, No.6, 2012, pp. 123, 126

¹⁰² Russia's Putin: Romney 'mistaken,' Obama 'honest', *NBC News*, Sep 6, 2012, available at <http://worldnews.nbcnews.com/news/2012/09/06/13705323-russias-putin-romney-mistaken-obama-honest>, accessed 10 March 2016.

¹⁰³ Angela Stent, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-5, 133.

¹⁰⁴ Harsh V. Pant and Yogesh Joshi, 'The American "Pivot" And The Indian Navy: It's Hedging All the Way', *Naval War College Review*, Winter 2015, Vol. 68, No. 1, p. 48.

than half of the world's economy, which had to be considered a high priority in creating and ensuring jobs for Americans.¹⁰⁵

Besides the economic gains and possibility of creating job opportunities, strengthening US alliances with the region was regarded by analysts as the foundation of such engagement. In building strategic partnership with its allies, the US was looking to create a stable security order which would ultimately lead to closer ties with each other.¹⁰⁶

Robert Hathaway was of the opinion that this pivot on the US part was aimed at reassuring its friends about US capacity, and was intended to build confidence among them in its strong leadership in the Asia-Pacific (something about which some Asian countries had become concerned about) and at the same time to warn competitors that the US still retained the determination and capability to lead.¹⁰⁷ This policy might also be thought mainly as an attempt to face the China challenge in what many call the 'China dilemma'.¹⁰⁸

Though looking for new partners and multilateral cooperation in Asia was on the foreign policy agenda of the Obama Administration, critics in the US said Obama was not committed to the Asia-Pacific. The pivot was not a strategic change, but a useful tactic to demonstrate to US citizens and the international community the US international resolve at a time when it was retreating from two wars.¹⁰⁹ But it became clear that maintaining strategic dominance and preventing China from rising and outweighing American influence in the region was the core US objective of this pivot.

Hathaway said such a pivot was not a new idea but had been in development since the 1990s with the end of the Cold War. He even quoted the Indian ambassador to US who mentioned that the concept of a pivot was hardly a new one. The Ambassador said Nehru used this term to characterise India even before India gained independence,

¹⁰⁵S.D. Muni & Vivek Chadha (Eds.), *op. cit.*, pp. 3-4.

¹⁰⁶Kurt Campbell and Brian Andrews, 'Explaining the US 'Pivot' to Asia', *The Asia Group*, Chatham House, August 2013, pp. 3-4.

¹⁰⁷Robert M. Hathaway, 'India and the US Pivot Asia', *Yale Global Online*, 24 February 2012.

¹⁰⁸S.D. Muni & Vivek Chadha (Eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 6.

¹⁰⁹Robert G. Sutter, Michael E. Brown, and Timothy J. A. Adamson with Mike M. Mochizuki and Deepa Ollapally, *Balancing Acts: The U.S. Rebalance and Asia-Pacific Stability*, Elliot School of International Affairs and Sigar Centre for Asian Studies of The George Washington University, August 2013, p. 27.

saying 'We are of Asia. . . . [India] is the pivot of Western, Southern, and Southeast Asia'.¹¹⁰

Whether the concept of the pivot was new or not, the point of discussion here is to ask: what did the US pivot toward Asia mean for India? Secretary Clinton, when explaining the pivot, defined the Asia-Pacific as reaching 'from the Indian subcontinent to the Western shores of the Americas'. Since one aim of the pivot was directed to the maritime balance of power in the Indo-Pacific, the Indian strategists argued that it would not gain as much traction in China as it gained both in the Pacific and the Indian Ocean.¹¹¹ The US plan for this pivot was to continue providing global security, which required a long-term partnership with India to maintain a healthy balance of power in maritime Asia.

This pivot policy was often seen as a reflection of increasing concern in the US about a constantly rising China which was, to many analysts, as an oversimplification. No doubt, the pivot revealed US uneasiness at China's future course. However, despite India's view of China as its long-term threat, the priorities of India and the US varied toward China. The Indian navy has been seeking a bigger role in the region and showed some unwillingness to increase coordination with American forces in the Indian Ocean and beyond. India appeared not to be willing to take part in any Sino-American rivalry or to be treated as a junior partner to the US in a cold war with China.¹¹²

5.4.1 Obama's Af-Pak Approach

For Obama, the Afghan war was not given due priority during the entire two terms of the Bush administration. He intended to put the war at the front of security agenda. In the first year of his first year in administration, Obama announced a new US policy toward Afghanistan and Pakistan at West Point military academy. The policy was the outcome of a careful and deliberate interagency review. Obama's Af-Pak policy, as it became known, became its top priority superseding the Iraqi theatre.¹¹³ The central goal of this policy for Afghanistan and Pakistan was 'to disrupt, dismantle, and eventually destroy extremists and their safe havens within both nations.' To implement this new

¹¹⁰ Robert M. Hathaway, 'India and the US Pivot Asia', *Yale Global Online*, 24 February 2012.

¹¹¹ Harsh V. Pant and Yogesh Joshi, *op. cit.*, pp. 47,52.

¹¹² Robert M. Hathaway, 'India and the US Pivot to Asia', *Yale Global Online*, 24 February 2012.

¹¹³ Jyotirmoy Banerjee, 'Obama's Af-Pak Dilemma', *Indian Journal of Asian Affairs*, Vol. 23, No. 1/2 (June-December 2010), p. 21.

policy, Obama pledged extra 30,000 US forces to Afghanistan, and the gradual withdrawal of US and NATO forces from the country, which would be started in the mid of 2011.¹¹⁴ To achieving his goal of keeping citizens safe from the threat of Al-Qaeda Obama adopted a three point strategy which included a partnership with Islamabad.¹¹⁵ Despite the interagency review revealing that Pakistan acted as host to terrorists,¹¹⁶ Washington continued to emphasise Pakistan's potential role in combating terrorism in the region, bringing stability and building the state capacity in Afghanistan by fostering reconciliation with moderate Taliban elements.

Initially, because the Obama administration expressed its intention to facilitate reconciliation of the Indo-Pak conflict over Kashmir with its Af-Pak policy, Pakistan welcomed the stance, Correspondingly, India became worried, and Indians thought Obama might be jeopardizing the achievements of the Bush administration. Although, as we have seen Indo-US bilateral relations were robust at the start of the Obama period the policy of addressing the Kashmir conflict made relations strained. However, Af-Pak policy was not the only component of Indo-US bilateral relations¹¹⁷ and the important point was to maintain good relations with India by decoupling India policy from the Af-Pak policy review. The consequence was that when Richard Holbrooke was made special envoy for Pakistan policy, Kashmir was excluded from his mandate¹¹⁸ and without this bone of contention souring relationships US cultivation of India could continue in parallel with the Af-Pak strategy.

5.4.2 India as a Counterweight to China – Commitment to Supporting India's Rise

As a candidate, Obama deliberately avoided criticising China on economic and other grounds. After assuming office, Obama sought an enduring and positive US relationship with China. He paid a visit to Beijing at the earliest possible opportunity once in office, and expressed his intention to establish closer relations with China.¹¹⁹ China's expanding power has been regarded as the most important development, not only to the

¹¹⁴Kavita R. Khory, 'Assessing "Af-Pak" Strategy: Regional Perspectives on the Obama Administration's Foreign Policy in South Asia', *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, Routledge, 37, p. 105, 2010.

¹¹⁵Uma Shankar, 'Obama's Af-Pak Strategy and Implications for South Asia', *Himalayan and Central Asian Studies*, Vol. 15 No. 1-2, Jan.-June 2011, pp. 94-5.

¹¹⁶Jyotirmoy Banerjee, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

¹¹⁷Kavita R. Khory, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-9, 2010.

¹¹⁸Muntazir Ali, 'Strategy for Peace: Af-Pak and Beyond', *Pakistan Horizon*, Vol. 63, No. 1 (January 2010), p. 59.

¹¹⁹Robert G. Sutter, Michael E. Brown, and Timothy J. A. Adamson, with Mike M. Mochizuki and Deepa Ollapally, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

United States but India as well. Both nations saw China as a major strategic challenge but interestingly neither wanted to be part of any anti-China alliance, but rather stressed the importance of engagement with Beijing.¹²⁰

The US has regarded China as a 'black box' for a long time, and its strategic relations with China have been characterised by distrust and uncertainty. The US saw the rise of China as both an opportunity and threat and Obama pursued a two-pronged approach to China. One approach was to reaffirm, engage, and strengthen cooperative relations. The second approach was to establish a strong and credible US presence across Asia to prevent Chinese regional hegemony, and it was this that led to the announcement of Obama's 'pivot to Asia'.¹²¹ But the pivot was not only about China and Obama recognised that the stress that Bush had placed on India as a counterweight to rising Chinese power was demeaning to India which had to be treated as a major power in its own right.

New Delhi has been branded with various names as great power, would be great power, regional power, global power, major power, emerging power or rising power and so on but whatever the label the fact that India was rising on all front was indisputable. And it was in the US interest to welcome this fact and to support India's rise to the global power status. Stephen Cohen was of the opinion that treating India as a rising power meant New Delhi should be regarded as one of the capitals that were consulted on major issues just as London, Moscow, Beijing, Berlin or Tokyo were. For issues having global impact, higher echelons of the administration in Washington should visit, discuss and or at least telephone those capitals. India may have different views on global issues but it is not necessarily hostile to US. India has got its own style of responding to global development, but through a regular consultation Washington may alter what has often been seen as an uncompromising Indian style. Cohen argued that New Delhi was not a great power that could challenge US military capacity or economic strength. But India's resources and growing strengths in various sectors in a transformed international order made New Delhi more vital to a wide range of US interests than any time in the last five

¹²⁰ Teresita C. Schaffer, *India and the United States in the 21st Century: Reinventing Partnership*, CSIS Press, Washington DC, 2009, p. 139.

¹²¹ Mark E. Manyin, Stephen Daggett, Ben Dolven, Susan V. Lawrence, et. al, 'Pivot to the Pacific? The Obama Administration's 'Rebalancing' Toward Asia', *CRS Report for Congress*, Congressional Research Service, March 28, 2012, p. 18.

decades. It may not be wise or even safe for the United States to ignore India in future as has past.¹²²

India has been able to draw much attention from the international community because of its rapid economic growth, its military capacity, its nuclear capacity and its changed approach to the United States.¹²³ But as Amrita Narlikar argues this did not necessarily make it a great power. Great power status comes with great responsibilities and India has been reluctant to supply global public goods on issues including climate change migration, free trade, international security, non-proliferation and responsibility to protect.¹²⁴ It is reasonable to assume that as it rises India's increasing integration in the global economy will lead to a gradual convergence of interests with other great powers which will ultimately create a sense of co-ownership within the international order and so increase India's willingness to accept the burdens of being a major power.¹²⁵ Compared to, for example, Brazil and China, India's rise is distinctive by virtue of its democratic political system, English Language and English culture among Indian elites and demographic advantage that trumps China's ageing population.¹²⁶ These factors mean that India's rise is well grounded and is the product of a long term incremental process however sudden or dramatic it may seem from the West.¹²⁷

To the US then, India, as a stable democracy, could be seen as an important counterweight to authoritarian China. Although the United States believed that India would not be part of any military alliance, a strong India, which has an uneasy relation with China on their borders, might pull Beijing into the region.¹²⁸ The emergence of China-centric Asia could push India to play an important role in supporting the US pivot. New Delhi generally welcomed the US policy of rebalancing Asia, but leaders in India remained sensitive and cautious about publicly embracing the initiative. Privately, however, they seemed to have encouraged greater US commitment to the Asia-

¹²² Stephen P. Cohen, India Rising, The Brookings Institution, June 1, 2000, available at <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/india-rising/>, accessed on 15 May 2018.

¹²³ Sunil Dasgupta & Stephen P. Cohen, 'Is India Ending its Strategic Restraint Doctrine?', *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 2, 2011, p. 163.

¹²⁴ Amrita Narlikar, 'Is India a Responsible Great Power?', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 9, 2011, p.1618

¹²⁵ Amrita Narlikar, 'India rising: responsible to whom?', *International Affairs*, Vol. 89, No. 3, p.596

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, p.595.

¹²⁷ Amrita Narlikar, 'All that Glitters is not Gold: India's rise to power', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No.5, 2007, p. 984.

¹²⁸ Manoj Joshi, 'India - A counterweight to the rise of China', *Mid -Day*, 16 September 2014, available at <http://www.mid-day.com/articles/india---a-counterweight-to-the-rise-of-china/15606168> accessed on 29 June 2015.

Pacific.¹²⁹ India was never enthusiastic about an anti-China partnership with the US, but rather sought to ease long-standing tensions on border issues and improve the overall bilateral relationship. New Delhi was happy to develop relations with Washington, but maintained a certain distance and was never likely to meet US aspirations for a formal alliance.¹³⁰

By the time Obama came to office the United States had a number of reasons to support the rise of India. Its rise would not weaken the US position in the global power balance; it would give India a stake in the international order; it would allow Washington to shape New Delhi's choices without the need for a formal alliance; it would facilitate American access to the South Asian region and assist the US in creating a favourable power balance in the East Asian region; and finally it would make China more accommodating.¹³¹ It is not surprising then that Obama asserted that 'India's rise is in the interest of the United States, regional and global stability, and global economic growth,' and that America was committed to being India's 'partner...in this transformation.'¹³²

President Obama, like President Bush, supported the rise of India as an emerging power and the expectation had risen that India would be the next to join the club of the major economic and strategic powers in the world. With this expectation, President Bush accorded India *de facto*¹³³ nuclear status. Similarly, President Obama, apart from some slight initial hesitations, has continued to recognise India 'as a valuable strategic partner', in spite of concentrating on Pakistan as the key ally in the War on Terror.¹³⁴

¹²⁹Robert G. Sutter, Michael E. Brown, and Timothy J. A. Adamson, with Mike M. Mochizuki and Deepa Ollapally, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

¹³⁰Ted Galen Carpenter 'Fading Hopes for India As a Strategic Counterweight to China', *China-US Focus*, 4 October 2013.

¹³¹Manjeet S. Pardesi, 'American Global Primacy and the Rise of India', *Asia Pacific Issue*, Analysis from the East-West Center No. 129, March 2017, p. 5

¹³²*Ibid.*, p. 2.

¹³³There were five *de jure* or declared nuclear-armed states. India became the sixth though not in a legal sense. With its nuclear deal with the United States, the US Congress hailed the NSG decision that provided a waiver to New Delhi which was a unique development conferring *de facto* status. With this deal, India has got the same advantages that the other five. India now can continue to maintain its nuclear weapons and at the same time can build weapons, and even it can expand its inventory if wants. And India also can access civilian nuclear cooperation without any hindrances to its civilian nuclear programme. These are privileges only accorded to the declared five nuclear states. Since the ratification of the nuclear agreement India has been accorded the same advantages and so enjoys *de facto* nuclear status.

¹³⁴Mehraj Uddin Gojree, 'The U.S. Interests and Policies towards South Asia: From Cold War Era to Strategic Rebalancing', *Research Journal of Language, Literature and Humanities*, Vol. 2, No. 4, April 2015, p.10

The Obama Administration supported the emergence of India and its 'Look East' policy not only to encourage India to play a role as a counterweight, but to encourage India to become a pro-Western power, and to prolong the US presence in the region. The US also supported India's rise in order to gain more and more access to India's markets.¹³⁵ Hillary Clinton made the US preference very clear during her visit to Chennai in 2011, when she said that the US supported India's 'Look East' policy and 'we encourage India not just to look East, but to engage East and act East as well'.¹³⁶

The United States wanted India to be a counterweight to China.¹³⁷ In terms of protecting trade and transit along sea-lines of communication, air lines of communication, and space, the US hoped that China would evolve in that direction but was concerned as to whether it would do so. India was already philosophically aligned with these principles, which is why America saw India as a correct choice to be a regionally ascendant power and a logical choice as a counterweight to China.¹³⁸

The United States wants to see an Asia not dominated by China and this is one reason the Obama Administration stationed troops in Darwin, Australia, and renewed ties with the Philippines to station its troops¹³⁹. If China becomes a more difficult player in the region, the US relationship with India could become much stronger, but there will not be an Indo-US alliance against China.¹⁴⁰ Obama saw India as a balancer but he knew India did not want to be a balancer and so he developed an Asian multilateral alliance similar to NATO, composed of India, Japan, Australia, and the United States. In this framework India could be a strong partner with a shared interest in keeping China in check.¹⁴¹

5.4.3 Obama's Policy toward India and Legacies of Gandhism

Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King are two esteemed heroes for Barack Obama. In his Nobel Peace Prize receiving ceremony in December 2009, Obama said 'as someone who stands here as a direct consequence of Dr. King's life work, I am living testimony to the moral force of non-violence. I know there's nothing weak- nothing

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p.7

¹³⁶ Robert M. Hathaway, 'India and the US Pivot to Asia', *Yale Global Online*, 24 February 2012.

¹³⁷ Ashley J. Tellis, 'India as a Leading Power', *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, Washington DC, April 2016, p.4.

¹³⁸ Interview with Thomas Lynch in Washington DC, December 5, 2012.

¹³⁹ Interview with Ambassador Anthony Quinton in Washington DC, December 4, 2012.

¹⁴⁰ Interview with Ambassador Howard Schaffer in Washington DC, December 5, 2012

¹⁴¹ Interview with Deepa Ollapally in Washington DC, December 6, 2012.

passive- nothing naïve- in the creed and lives of Gandhi and King'. Obama expressed his passion to Gandhi saying 'He is a hero not just to India, but to the world'. In his opinion Gandhi's life has provided inspiration to the Americans and African Americans.¹⁴² Martin Luther King was largely inspired by Gandhi. Obama is a self-confessed hero of Gandhi and in his various speeches he often mentioned Gandhi that he (Gandhi) has great influence on him. Obama also said, 'It was Gandhi's understanding of India's stories and traditions, his attention to the marginalised voices in Africa, that helped him gather a movement that drove out the world's most successful empire'.¹⁴³

Undoubtedly, Obama showed deep respect for Gandhian non-violent philosophy in facing any forces threatening the peace in the modern world. This stance has become questionable when any one critically analyzes Obama's firm belief in his concept of 'just war' which accepts that sometimes the use of force have proved to have been necessary and justified. Obama's respect to Gandhian philosophy of non-violence and his strong belief of using force as a mean to reach the end, peace, became paradoxical as Gandhian philosophy requires full commitment that violence and use of forces should be avoided at any time and every time.¹⁴⁴ Analyzing Obama's stance on using force and waging necessary war clearly indicates that his references to Gandhian philosophy have really nothing to do with Gandhism. Obama's reference to Gandhi is not just paradoxical; it is contradictory. Despite this, Obama persistently used Gandhi's as a reference because of the link to Martin Luther King and his praise for Gandhian philosophy.¹⁴⁵ It was, in other words, a rhetorical device more rather than a statement of followership.

5.5 Conclusion

Obama assumed the presidency at time when the US faced difficult problems including deepest recession, two inconclusive major wars, a war on terror and a damaged image worldwide. Obama took those challenges as opportunities and adopted a series of policies to meet these challenges. He sought to minimise conflict and avoided

¹⁴²President Barack Obama invoked Mahatma Gandhi while seeking re-election, NDTV, November 07, 2012.

¹⁴³Barack Obama praises Mahatma Gandhi for driving out world's most successful empire, The Indian Express, 22, 2017.

¹⁴⁴Tamer Söyler, Gandhi, 'Civilization, Non-Violence and Obama', *Transcience Journal*, Vol 1, No 1, 2010, p.22.

¹⁴⁵*Ibid.*, p.31.

confrontations through a policy of multilateralism. His stance on nuclear policy including gradual reduction of nuclear stockpiles, and thus achieving a world free of nuclear weapons brought a Nobel Peace Prize. His policy toward terrorism helped the United States to move beyond the image of a country waging a war against Islam. He gave priority to the Afghan war, and developed an Af-Pak policy that was a deliberate initiative to destroy the extremists and their safe havens within this two countries. Finally, realising that the importance of Asian strategic development could not be overlooked, Obama sought to enhance the US relationship with the Asian states that had been flawed under the previous administration.

On relations with India he continued the assessment of the Bush administration post 9/11 that India should become a strategic partner of the US. Obama even changed the terminology describing the US's relationship with India, using the term 'indispensable partnership' over 'natural partnership'. US interests in South Asia demanded a stable region, requiring that there be no escalation between India and Pakistan.¹⁴⁶ He believed that it would be better for the US to work with Islamabad by providing assistance for a more effective performance in the War on Terror. But this ran in parallel with support for India, evidenced by the lack of pressure placed on the Kashmir issue.¹⁴⁷ And finally India's role as a counterweight to China's rise remained vital to the US. Although there would be no formal anti-China alliance a partnership with India would materially enhance America's strategic influence in the region.

Obama's assessment of America's place in the world when he took office was governed by a very different approach to his predecessor. He developed a set of principles through which he would seek to restore the US position while recognising embracing and adapting to the fundamental shifts that were taking place in the international system whether the US wanted them to or not. Guided by these principles the administration sought to put them into practice, including in relation to India. Given the magnitude of the challenges he faced and the inexperience of a new administration, it was never likely that the process of implementation would run smoothly and it did not. In the next chapter, an attempt will be made to illustrate how, and how far, the Obama

¹⁴⁶ David Rothkopf, *National Insecurity: American Leadership in an Age of Fear*, Public Affairs, New York, 2014, p. 157.

¹⁴⁷ Interview with Ambassador Anthony Quinton in Washington DC, December 4, 2012.

Administration managed to meet these challenges and to implement its policies towards India.

CHAPTER – SIX

Implementation of Obama's Policies toward India

6.1 Introduction

It has been discussed in the previous chapter that President Obama dreamed of and promised change, investing efforts to meet ambitious promises, and undertaking attempts to redefine an altered US world view with the evolving historical context of the current century. The thrust of this chapter is to explore how far he has been successful in fulfilling his promises and particularly how much change he has brought to the realm of US foreign policy, and, most importantly, the changes made in his policy toward India.

Although under the Obama Administration the strategic importance of India to the US remained high, Indo-US relations initially lost the momentum they had gained during the Bush Administration. US relations with India in first year of the Obama Administration were not seen to be as cordial as in the previous administration. But after this hiatus the Obama Administration took steps to improve relations.

US relations with India during Obama's presidency were initially hindered by factors such as the nuclear issue, the US's Afghan-Pakistan policy, the Kashmir conflict, and the administration's early focus on China, which to an extent marginalised India. This chapter will describe the missteps taken by the administration and the initiatives and actions that subsequently led to improving ties, including US commitment to support India's rise as a global player, its support for India's seat in the reformed UNSC, introducing and continuing strategic dialogue and the decision to advance the Indo-US nuclear deal signed by the Bush Administration. The chapter will also elucidate the winding down the Afghan war, and how it impacted on Indo-US relations. The chapter will also critically discuss how the United States wanted to see India playing its role in counterbalancing China.

Despite the initial US strain relations with India, the administration proved by its subsequent steps that India was a natural ally to US and that there was a strategic

partnership based on common interests. In spite of the ups and downs Indo-US relations followed an upward trajectory in the first Obama administration.

6.2 Initial Technical Mistakes Made by Obama – Rookie Mistakes¹ led to Strained Relations with India

After eight years of good relations between the United States and India under President Bush, when President Obama came to power there developed a suspicion in India over whether the new Democratic Administration would halt further improvement in Indo-US relations. Such suspicion was justified by some initial steps taken by the Obama Administration.

The first mistake came when President-Elect Obama made a number of introductory calls to world leaders that included Pakistani President Zardari but did not include Indian Premier, Mr Singh. Not only that, but immediately after assuming the presidency, the Obama team made a public list of US foreign policy goals in which India did not feature, making India suspicious of US interests and intentions toward the region.² Likewise, when President Obama paid his first visit to the Asia-Pacific in November 2009, he not only bypassed India but skipped any mention of it in a speech outlining the vision and goals of his administration in the region³ in which he pledged to ‘strengthen old alliances and build new partnerships with the nations of this region’.⁴ During Obama’s visit to Beijing, he delivered a communiqué that further ignored India but conferred a major role on China in maintaining security affairs in the region, thereby worsening the Indo-US drift.⁵ All these mistakes were made at a time when the Indian Premier was about to visit the US for a state visit, and it was interesting because Mr. Singh was given the symbolic honour of being the first official guest at the White House under the Obama Administration. When Prime Minister Singh arrived, President Obama

¹Some of the initial steps taken by the Obama administration in regard to its relations with India were considered mistakes due to inexperience rather than intentional slights. These steps might best be described rookie mistakes that could be compensated for were unlikely to do lasting damage.

²David J Karl, ‘US-India Relations: The Way Forward’, *ORBIS*, Vol. 56, No. 2, Spring 2012, p. 313.

³For an Indian reaction see Bhaskar Roy, ‘President Obama’s Asia Swing: Not Very Harmonious for South Asia’, Paper No. 3516, *South Asia Analysis Group*, Noida, India, November 2009.

⁴Remarks by President Barack Obama at Suntory Hall, The White House. Office of the Press Secretary, November 14, 2009, available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-barack-obama-suntory-hall>, accessed 11 March 12, 2016.

⁵Ashley J. Tellis, ‘Obama in India, Building a Global Partnership: Challenges, Risks, Opportunities’, *Policy Outlook*, Carnegie Endowment For International Peace, Washington, October, 2010, p. 4.

said that he regarded the Indian premier, and India itself, as very much part of his own family.⁶

Another noticeable stance of President Obama which led to strain relations with India was his reluctance to complete the Indo-US nuclear pact. As a senator, Obama took a negative position on the pact, which recognised India as a responsible nuclear power, though he finally voted in favour.⁷

During his first few months in office he continued to place less importance on India than it deserved. The harsh reality was that President Obama hardly mentioned India in public after he assumed the presidency. If one looks at the number of foreign trips made by the President and Secretary Clinton, it becomes clear that India was not given priority by the Obama Administration. Secretary Clinton visited India in July 2009, but before that president and secretary had visited 27 countries in the first seven months of the Administration.⁸ Secretary Clinton was able to mitigate some of the worries prevailing in India, although her visit in July 2009 did not leave a clear avenue to an improved Indo-US relationship.⁹

Indo-US relations had also been strained over Obama's approach to handling the Taliban and his linking of the Kashmir issue to the instability in the region, especially in Pakistan and Afghanistan. Obama's remarks about intervening in the Kashmir dispute even before assuming the presidency caused disappointment in India. When President Obama appointed Richard Holbrooke as the president's special envoy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, and considered whether to extend his brief to include Kashmir, this raised the possibility of confrontation with India and dismay in New Delhi. The confrontation was avoided when the Obama Administration decided not to include any part of India in Holbrooke's brief.¹⁰ The Obama administration was criticised on the grounds that, in South Asia, India could play a vital role in rebuilding war-torn Afghanistan. Indian scholars criticised Obama as 'barking up the wrong tree'. Analysing the Obama

⁶ David J Karl, *op. cit.*, p.313.

⁷ Thomas Mathew, 'Fault Lines in the Nascent Partnership: India-US Relations under the Obama Presidency', In Thomas Mathew (Ed.), *In Search of Congruence Perspectives on India-US Relations under the Obama Administration*, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi, 2010, pp. 2-3.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp.4-5.

⁹ David M. Malone and Rohan Mukherjee, 'India-US Relations: The Shock of the New', *International Journal*, Vol. 64, No. 4, Canada and Asia, 2009, p. 1072.

¹⁰ Ashley J. Tellis, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

Administration's initial attitudes toward India, Harsh Pant concluded that Washington had very little time for New Delhi.¹¹

Lisa Curtis argued that the strained Indo-US relationship during the initial period of the Obama Administration was not only because of missteps taken by the Administration, but because of US domestic politics, economic recession, and record high unemployment. Because of the recession, Obama time and again criticised the practice of business outsourcing to India.¹²

A change in the attitude of the Obama Administration was seen in mid-2010, however, when higher echelons of the Administration started to realise the importance building up strategic relations with emerging India as a counterbalance against the rise of China, as had been understood by the previous Bush Administration. The Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, William J. Burns, asserted openly that India's strength and progress on the world stage was deeply in the strategic interest of the US, and he further said that 'This Administration has been, and will remain, deeply committed to supporting India's rise and to building the strongest possible partnership between us'.¹³

6.3 Divergence of Approaches and Sources of Tensions between the US and India under the Obama Administration

Indo-US relations were strained for at least a year after Obama came to office. Apart from the issues mentioned above, there were other matters that raised concern that, taken cumulatively, were a source of tension. These sources of tension were increasingly making India unhappy in its relations with the United States.¹⁴

Obama's enthusiastic multilateral diplomatic approach in Asia made India more concerned. During the entire period of 2009 and much of 2010, until Obama's visit to India, US policy was not focussed on bilateral relationships, as it had been under the Bush Administration. During this period Washington paid too much attention to its relations with Beijing in such a way that threatened to lessen India's influence in the

¹¹ Harsh V. Pant, 'India's New-Found Irrelevance', *Outlook*, March 24, 2009 and Pant, 'The Thrill is Gone', *Outlook*, July 22, 2009.

¹² Lisa Curtis, 'Going the Extra Mile for a Strategic US-India Relationship', *Backgrounders*, The Heritage Foundation, Washington, No. 2719, August 20, 2012, p.2.

¹³ William J. Burns, 'India's Rise and the Promise of US-Indian Partnership', A Speech delivered by the Under Secretary for Political Affairs, Council on Foreign Relations, Washington, DC, June 1, 2010, available at <http://www.state.gov/p/us/rm/2010/136718.htm>, accessed 3rd January 2016.

¹⁴ Siddhartha Srivastava, 'US-India Relations Strained Under Obama', *World Politics Review*, June 16, 2009.

region. The US also intended to deepen relations with India's arch enemy, Pakistan, which raised the serious security concern in New Delhi that the US might apply an interventionist approach to the conflict on the request of Pakistan.¹⁵ President Obama's initial intention to re-hyphenate Pakistan and India in US policy calculations and insert America in the Kashmir issue raised serious concern among the policy-makers in New Delhi. Later, however, Obama proved himself a reliable champion of Indo-US bilateral relations, evidenced by the US engagement with India in a number of vital areas, and his decision to give up the habit of seeing India through the so-called Af-Pak lens.¹⁶

It has been discussed earlier that there were differences in approach between the US and India regarding nuclear technology. Although President Obama and India were committed to nuclear disarmament, they had different views on how to achieve it. The US wanted to achieve it through the NPT, but India disagreed. The Obama Administration essentially put the nuclear deal on the backburner, and did not pay significant attention to whether American companies were fulfilling their obligations in making contracts with India.¹⁷ The US wanted India to enact laws limiting the liabilities of foreign companies in case of nuclear accident, but India wanted to assign the liabilities to the suppliers rather than operators, which discouraged American companies, as well as French and Russian manufacturers, from finalising sales to India.¹⁸

Tensions arose between India and the US due to Pakistan's stance on terrorism and the future of Afghanistan. In the wake of the 9/11 attacks, India started to believe that the US would force Pakistan to relinquish its relations with, and reliance on, terrorist proxies. Over the years, however, US relations with Pakistan have been such that India has given up hope that the US would pressure Pakistan to change its policies toward terrorism.¹⁹ Many officials in Washington held views similar to those in Islamabad, that peace in the South Asian region was intimately related to the Kashmir conflict.²⁰ In the event, the administration tried to keep its distance from taking any direct stand in the

¹⁵K. Alan Kronstadt, Paul K. Kerr, Michael F. Martin & Bruce Vaughn, 'India: Domestic Issues, Strategic Dynamics, and U.S. Relations', *Congressional Research Service*, September 1, 2011, p. 5.

¹⁶David J Karl, *op. cit.*, p. 311.

¹⁷Thomas Mathew, *op. cit.*, p.8.

¹⁸Robert J. Einhorn, 'Counter-proliferation: A Shared Objective for India and the US', in *The Modi-Obama Summit: A Leadership Moment for India and the United States*, Brookings India Initiative, September 2014, p. 33.

¹⁹Lisa Curtis, 'Going the Extra Mile for a Strategic US-India Relationship', *op. cit.*, p.3.

²⁰US Aims to Ease India-Pakistan Tension', *Wall Street Journal*, April 5, 2010.

conflict. Richard Holbrooke actually technically avoided even using the name 'Kashmir' and used the letter 'K' instead. During a discussion about Kashmir in February 2010 he said: 'we are not going to negotiate or mediate on that issue and I'm going to try to keep my record and not even mention it by name'.²¹

India was very much concerned about US policies toward Afghanistan. In order to mitigate Pakistan's worry about the formation of a Delhi-Kabul axis against Islamabad, the United States put pressure on New Delhi to limit its diplomatic presence in Afghanistan. This undermined US overall strategy in the region, and caused great frustration in India.²² In February 2011, when Secretary Clinton suggested the US might soften its policy towards the Taliban, this caused much discomfort for India, which remained sceptical of rehabilitating Taliban leaders.²³

The US and India had significant policy differences over the future course of action on Afghanistan, which has been a continuous source of contention between them. As the Indian government had heavily invested in Afghanistan over the previous decade, India was particularly concerned about what would be the post-American settlement in Afghanistan and how its interest would be protected. The United States did not seem concerned about the protection of Indian interests. This policy difference between them negatively impacted their bilateral relations.²⁴

The Indo-US relationship has also been impacted by the Indian attitude toward Iran over the nuclear issue. India very much valued its relationship with Iran. Although India in principle opposed the Iranian pursuit of nuclear weapons and supported UN sanctions against it, it was unwilling to support US unilateral sanction as India did not want to sacrifice its long-standing historical, cultural cordial relations with Iran. India consistently tried to maintain its relations both with Iran and the US. India was unwilling to publicly support US sanctions against Tehran as it has a very strong lobby at home favouring deep Indo-Iranian ties. New Delhi's unwillingness to impose oil

²¹ See State Department's February 3, 2010 at <http://fpc.state.gov/136466.htm>

²² Lisa Curtis, 'Going the Extra Mile for a Strategic US-India Relationship', *op. cit.*, pp.3-4.

²³ Walter Andersen & Shrey Verma, 'Washington's India Pivot: Is it Compatible with Modi's Asian Ambitions?' *India Quarterly*, Vol. 71, No. 2, 2015, p. 104.

²⁴ David J. Karl, *op. cit.*, pp. 315-6.

sanctions against Iran, as the US wanted, was a source of tension, even though India quietly had been trying to reduce its dependence on Iranian oil.²⁵

The Indian government also became frustrated by the moves (India called it a protectionist agenda) taken by the Obama Administration to limit the number of Indian workers in the United States. The Obama Administration introduced a tougher policy for the Indian highly skilled workers, making it harder for them to get jobs in the US. The visa denial rate²⁶ for Indian researchers and professionals was higher than that of any other country during the first Obama Administration, causing yet more tension between India and the US.²⁷

All the above issues and factors caused concern for Indo-US relations, and one can safely say that there was no honeymoon period in Indo-US relations after Obama's 2008 election victory.

6.4 Improved Relations with India as a Rising Global Player

After the period of strained Indo-US relations, the Obama Administration took certain initiatives to bring their relationship back to the level of cordiality enjoyed during the Bush Administration. The first step toward mitigating the strain in relations was taken by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh in his visit to the US on 24 November 2009, which was first visit of any head of government to the Obama Administration.²⁸ The visit proved a very successful one, and President Obama was able to state how important India was to the US in building security and prosperity of the world. For the first time, he even said: 'India an indispensable partner as the two countries build a future of security and prosperity for all nations'. During that visit, the President also acknowledged India as a nuclear power and backed the Indo-US Civil Nuclear Agreement signed by the Bush Administration.²⁹ Many critics said that, although the visit was important in symbolic sense, the outcome was not satisfactory as there was no

²⁵Lisa Curtis, 'Going the Extra Mile for a Strategic US-India Relationship', *op. cit.*, p. 6.

²⁶The National Foundation for American Policy - a US think tank - says that data collected from the US Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services shows a dramatic increase in denials for both H-1B (Temporary work) and L-1 (Intra-company transfer).

²⁷ Lisa Curtis, 'Going the Extra Mile for a Strategic US-India Relationship', *op. cit.*, p.3

²⁸President Barack Obama Entertains India's PM Manmohan Singh, *The Telegraph*, 25 Nov 2009, also see *India's Foreign Relations -2013 Documents*, XPD Division, Ministry of External Affairs, India, p. 1673.

²⁹Walter K. Anderson, 'Reviving the Momentum in US Engagement with India: An American Perspective', *India Quarterly*, Vol. 66, No. 1, 2010, p.14.

breakthrough. It can be safely said, however, that this visit was a milestone in pacifying the concerns that India had toward Obama.

Before Manmohan Singh's visit, Secretary Clinton's four-day visit to India in July 2009 served as a significant step to strengthening the US relationship and deepening its partnership with India.³⁰ When she met Indian Foreign Minister Krishna they agreed to 'further strengthen the excellent bilateral relationship'.³¹ Clinton's visit was largely considered a success, and Clinton made an important symbolic point by holding a high-profile meeting with a women's group at Mumbai's Taj Mahal Hotel. While in New Delhi, Clinton set forth five key pillars of Indo-US engagement, namely: 1) strategic cooperation; 2) energy and climate change; 3) economics, trade, and agriculture; 4) science technology and 5) innovation.³²

In Obama's first State of the Union address on 27 January 2010, India figured twice, and he bracketed India with Germany and China, saying: 'These nations aren't playing for second place. They're putting more emphasis on math and science. They're rebuilding their infrastructure'.³³ Obama's intention to continue the Bush Administration's effort to build a special relationship with India was evidenced by the following steps: first, Obama's visit to India in November 2010; second, mentioning India's importance in his National Security Strategy of 2010; third, Secretary Clinton's second visit to India in July 2011; fourth, the US desire for India to play an enhanced role in Asia; and finally, Clinton's urge to India in November 2012 to play a larger role in Asian institutions and affairs.

The main difference was that whereas the Bush Administration wanted to build a shared identity with ideas of freedom, the Obama Administration wanted to do so through a rule-based international order, where US leadership would be central and India would be treated as indispensable.³⁴

³⁰ Ahmad Ejaz, 'United States - India Relations: An Expanding Strategic Partnership', *Pakistan Vision*, Vol. 13 No. 1, p. 148.

³¹ K. Alan Kronstadt, Paul K. Kerr, Michael F. Martin & Bruce Vaughn, 'India: Domestic Issues, Strategic Dynamics, and U.S. Relations', *Congressional Research Service*, September 1, 2011, p. 5.

³² K. Alan Kronstadt, Paul K. Kerr, Michael F. Martin and Bruce Vaughn, 'India-US Relations', *CRS Report for Congress*, Congressional Research Service, 2010, p.3.

³³ Barack Obama, State of the Union Address, January 27, 2010, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/obama/speeches/speech-5706>, accessed 6 January 2016.

³⁴ Priya Chacko, 'A New "Special Relationship"?': Power Transitions, Ontological Security, and India-US Relations', *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 15, 2014, p.336

6.4.1 Defence Relationships

The United States already recognised military power of India in the Indian Ocean region. The United States realised and acknowledged that a strong Indo-US relationship had the potential to change the political contours and the power dynamics not only in Asia but in the world as well. Since India has the most capable military, vibrant economy, and is the most dynamic country in the region, so military ties with it would be key to the Indo-US partnership. During his visit to New Delhi in May 2012, Leon Panetta, the US Secretary of Defence, highlighted India's importance and prominence in the new US defence strategy of pivoting to Asia. He said: 'Defence cooperation with India is a linchpin in this strategy'.³⁵ It was hardly a secret that the United States wanted India to increase its geopolitical footprint in Asia. Again, in July 2012, Leon Panetta said that the United States desired to work with India to modernise the bureaucratic processes to encourage more defence trade, and he nominated Ashton Carter to accomplish the job.³⁶

In order to develop the Indo-US strategic partnership, defence relations were a key component and the realization of partnership largely depended on increased Indian preparedness to purchase and integrate into the US system.³⁷ Indo-US defence ties grew, though still not at the expected level. In spite of setbacks, such as India's decision to purchase French fighter jets, the United States signed \$8 billion in defence contracts with New Delhi in this period, making the US the largest arms seller to India. Contracts included the sale of C-130J and C-17 transport aircraft and P-81 maritime surveillance aircraft.³⁸ The US Defence Department Report of 2011 recommended providing India with information on the F-35 joint Strike Fighter. The report also suggested sending a signal to India that the US considered it one of its important defence partners for the years to come and the United States was even ready to consider joint-production of many of its highly sophisticated defence technologies.³⁹

³⁵ Amb. Karl F. Inderfurth and S. Amer Latif, 'US.-India Military Engagement: Steady as She Goes', *US-India Insight*, CSIS, Vol. 2, Issue 10, October 2012.

³⁶ Lisa Curtis, 'Going the Extra Mile for a Strategic US-India Relationship', *op. cit.*, p.8.

³⁷ The US-India Defence Relationship: An Update for President Obama's State Visit to India, *NBR Workshop Report*, November 2010, p. 2.

³⁸ Lisa Curtis, 'Going the Extra Mile for a Strategic US-India Relationship', *op. cit.*, p.7.

³⁹ US Department of Defence, 'Report to Congress on US-India Security Cooperation', November 2011, http://www.defence.gov/pubs/pdfs/20111101_NDAA_Report_on_US_India_Security_Cooperation.pdf

During the Obama period the defence sales to India were at all-time high and military ties have deepened as forces from both sides increasingly participate in joint exercises. Indo-US Army Cooperation providing training for war known as *Yudh Abhyas* started in 2001 and the largest exercise of its kind ever held was in 2009 in India. India came to conduct more joint exercises with the US than any other country. In 2011 alone, there were 56 cooperative events from all services. Joint naval exercises also grew dramatically. In 2010, Indian Integrated Defence Staff (IDS) and US Pacific Command (USPACOM) conducted the inaugural joint exercise in Alaska⁴⁰ and again in 2012 they held Joint Exercise India (JEI), which included a command post.

There was, however, a major gap between the US and India when it came to the issue of the transfer of sensitive technology. With regard to technology transfers, India perceived that the US was refusing Indian access to its sensitive technologies. The US State Department rejected this, stating that less than 1% export control licenses were denied to India. The Pentagon reformed its rules and regulations governing American defence exports from time to time and the US felt the bilateral relationship would benefit if India pursued similar reforms.⁴¹ It is important to mention here to the context that the Obama administration firmly believed and once expressed a view that even if other initiatives, steps or agreements failed to bring India on board, nothing would hamper bilateral military to military cooperation.⁴²

6.4.2 Advancement of the Indo-US Nuclear Deal

Obama's thinking on nuclear weapons and his stance as a senator on the Indo-US nuclear deal gave an early impression of uncertainty as to whether his administration would maintain US relations with India with the same vigour as was maintained by the Bush Administration. Despite having voted in favour of the deal, he remained strongly in disagreement with certain provisions in the bill, and was reluctant to give India a special status as a responsible nuclear power. During his entire campaign, Obama had vehemently opposed any nuclear weapons deal, evident in his killer amendments to the Indo-US nuclear deal which sanctioned the '123 Agreement' with India. India became concerned over whether Obama would put up more hindrances as president in

⁴⁰ K. Alan Kronstadt and Sonia Pinto, 'India-U.S. Security Relations: Current Engagement', Congressional Research Report, November 13, 2012, pp. 8-9.

⁴¹ Lisa Curtis, 'Going the Extra Mile for a Strategic US-India Relationship', *op. cit.*, p.8.

⁴² Report to Congress on U.S.-India Security Cooperation, U.S. Department of Defense, November 2011, p. 23.

implementing the Indo-US Nuclear agreement signed in October 2008.⁴³ It was also the case that while the Bush Administration was eager to develop a partnership with India, the Obama Administration initially seemed less committed to carrying on the same policy. After assuming office it became obvious that President Obama had essentially put the nuclear deal on the backburner, whereas President Bush had been enthusiastic about elevating India as an influential and responsible global player.⁴⁴

India's worries became more pertinent when President Obama decided to appoint Robert Einhorn as the Undersecretary for International Security Affairs. It caused uneasiness to strategists in India, as Einhorn had earlier been opposed to the Indo-US nuclear agreement. They even scolded him as a 'non-proliferation ayatollah'.⁴⁵ As soon as President Obama realised the reality, importance, and emerging role of India, however, he revisited the nuclear deal with India.⁴⁶ Having realised the fact that the nuclear deal was never only about India buying a few reactors from the United States, but about an opportunity to alter the world order fundamentally, the Administration made clear that it would go along with the nuclear deal.

For the issuance of licenses for US nuclear exports to India, it was required that the president notify Congress that the declaration from India regarding its nuclear facilities was not inconsistent with the facilities of the agency, and its IAEA safeguards agreement had entered into force. India signed its safeguards agreement on 2 February 2009 and it entered into force on 11 May of the same year, and India also submitted its nuclear facilities declarations of the safeguards agreement accordingly. Consequently, President Obama submitted the required certification to Congress on 3 February 2010, and determined that New Delhi had fulfilled the legal requirements.⁴⁷

When the Obama administration made clear that it would go along with the deal, several high officials in Washington, including Secretary Clinton, restated that Indo-US nuclear

⁴³ A. Vinod Kumar, 'A Doctrine at Work: Obama's Evolving Nuclear Policy and What it Bodes for India', *Strategic Analysis*, Vol. 35, No. 2, March 2011, pp. 215-6.

⁴⁴ M.K. Bahadrakumar, 'India frets over Obama's Chinamania', *Asia Times* 14 March 2009, available at http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South_Asia/KC14Df01.html, Accessed 11 January 2016.

⁴⁵ Alex Stolar, 'Non-Proliferation Ayatollahs or Thoughtful Scholars: Understanding the American Non-Proliferation Lobby', Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, India, 6 July 2006, available at <http://www.ipcs.org/article/us-south-asia/non-proliferation-ayatollahs-or-thoughtful-scholars-understanding-the-american-non-2062.html>, accessed 15 March 2016.

⁴⁶ M.K. Bahadrakumar, *op. cit.*

⁴⁷ Paul K. Kerr, 'U.S. Nuclear Cooperation with India: Issues for Congress', *Congressional Research Service*, June 26, 2012, p. 3.

cooperation was a commitment of the American government. In responding to a question in October 2009, Secretary Clinton said; ‘the nuclear accord, which we support – I supported it as a senator, the Obama Administration supports it as a government – is embedded in a broader strategic dialogue that we are engaged in with the Indians. We view our relationship as one that is comprehensive and very deep in terms of the issues that we wish to explore with our Indian counterparts and the areas where we are either already or looking to cooperate’.⁴⁸

In spite of the ups and downs, the Obama Administration finally endorsed, and gave a go-ahead to the Bush Administration’s policy of Indo-US nuclear cooperation. Obama acknowledged India as an important strategic partner and described the nuclear deal with India as a landmark achievement that also set the stage for a move toward commercial cooperation in the civil nuclear energy agreement.⁴⁹ The White House Fact Sheet of November 2010 affirmed that the US intended to support India’s full membership not only of the Nuclear Suppliers Group, but in three other multilateral export control regimes: the Missile Technology Control Regime, the Australia Group (for chemical and biological controls), and the Wassenaar Arrangement (for dual-use and conventional arms controls).⁵⁰

But still there remained a question why the Obama Administration took so long after this early period to finally ratify the agreement. No doubt, it was a misstep on the part of the Obama Administration not to give the deal a go ahead. This was because of at least two reasons: Firstly, since the beginning of the deal Obama was not in favour of the deal and he wanted a world without nuclear weapons, as he eloquently articulated in his Prague speech. The deal actually hurt the progress toward Obama’s view of total elimination of nuclear weapons and undermined the NPT. Secondly, the Bush Administration wanted India to counter a rising China and the deal was largely directed toward that end, but initially the Obama Administration did not want to alienate China and downplayed the tie with India so as not to risk the relationship with China.

⁴⁸Rajiv Nayan, ‘The Obama Administration and Nuclear Issues’, *In Search of Congruence Perspectives on India-US Relations under the Obama Administration*, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi, 2010, p. 65.

⁴⁹ Ahmad Ejaz, *op. cit.*, 147.

⁵⁰ Fact Sheet: US-India Partnership on Export Controls and Non-Proliferation, White House, November 8, 2010, available at https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/india-factsheets/India-US_Agreement_on_Export_Controls.pdf, accessed 11 January 2016.

6.4.3 Strategic Dialogue

Having considered the trend of Indo-US relations since the end of the Cold war, many analysts viewed the US relationship with India as one of the world's most important relations in the present and for decades to come. In pursuit of this, the 'US-India 3.0' diplomacy was seen on display in the second half of 2011, when a large delegation of US officials visited India on the occasion of the second US-India Strategic Dialogue session held in New Delhi, where they discussed a wide range of bilateral and global issues.⁵¹

Secretary Clinton and Mr. Krishna strengthened Indo-US bilateral relations through an enhanced strategic partnership between them. The results of their efforts were the establishment of the Strategic Dialogue and measures of civil nuclear cooperation.⁵² The US-India Strategic Dialogue was established in July 2009 during Secretary Clinton's visit to India. It was established with the objective of strengthening Indo-US bilateral co-operation in various sectors to serve as the 'capstone' dialogue between them. The purpose of the Dialogue was to assess the progress, provide policy guidance, and propose new areas of cooperation in their relations. The first round of the Strategic Dialogue was held in Washington DC in June 2010, the second round in New Delhi in July 2011, and the third round again in Washington in June 2012.⁵³

The importance of this Strategic Dialogue was mentioned in the US National Security Strategy of May 2010 announced by President Obama. The 2010 NSS said that India and the US were building a strategic partnership between them that was underpinned by the shared interests and values of the largest, oldest, and most successful democracies in the world, and involved making a close connection between the people of both nations.

Working together through our Strategic Dialogue and high-level visits, we seek a broad-based relationship in which India contributes to global counterterrorism efforts, non-proliferation, and helps promote poverty-reduction, education, health, and sustainable agriculture. We value

⁵¹K. Alan Kronstadt, Paul K. Kerr, Michael F. Martin & Bruce Vaughn, 'India: Domestic Issues, Strategic Dynamics, and U.S. Relations', *Congressional Research Service*, September 1, 2011, p.

⁵²Mayang A. Rahawestri, 'Obama's Foreign Policy in Asia: More Continuity than Change', *Security Challenges*, Vol. 6, No. 1, Autumn 2010, p.115.

⁵³<http://mea.gov.in/Portal/ForeignRelation/United-States-of-America-March-2012.pdf>, accessed on 10 July 2015.

India's growing leadership on a wide array of global issues, through groups such as the G20, and will seek to work with India to promote stability in South Asia and elsewhere in the world.⁵⁴

The Strategic Dialogue had five pillars: strategic cooperation; education and development; energy and climate change; economics, trade, and agriculture; and science and technology, health, and innovation. During the first round of the strategic dialogue, Secretary Clinton, as the head of the US delegation, praised India as the Indian delegation attended the dialogue with a large number of high officials led by Indian External Affairs Minister, Mr. Krishna. Secretary Clinton described India as 'an indispensable partner and a trusted friend' and President Obama also appeared for a very short time at the reception of the State Department to announce his firm belief that the Indo-US relationship would be a defining partnership in the 21st century. Following the strategic dialogue, a joint statement was produced in which both states promised to deepen people-to-people, government-to-government, and business-to-business link for mutual benefit, and for promoting peace, stability and prosperity in the world. The statement summarised ten key areas of bilateral initiatives: 1) Advancing Global Security and Countering Terrorism, 2) Disarmament and Non Proliferation, 3) Trade and Economic Relations, 4) High Technology, 5) Energy Security, Clean Energy and Climate Change, 6) Agriculture, 7) Education, 8) Health, 9) Science and Technology, and 10) Development.⁵⁵

William J. Burns delivered a policy speech titled 'India's rise and the future of the US-India relationship' in which he anticipated the Strategic Dialogue as such: 'The simple truth is that India's strength and progress on the world stage is deeply in the strategic interest of the United States'.⁵⁶ He said that the progress in the Indo-US partnership was not an automatic one, but rather it would require a sustained effort from both parties. He also wanted to mitigate the Indians' concern and perception that the US saw New Delhi through the prism of its ties with Islamabad and was overly focused on Beijing,

⁵⁴ National Security Strategy, May 2010, The White House, pp. 43-4, available at https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf, accessed 12 January 2016.

⁵⁵ US-India Strategic Dialogue Joint Statement, Media Note, Office of the Spokesman, Washington, DC, June 3, 2010, available at <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2010/06/142645.htm>, accessed 12 January 2016.

⁵⁶ William J. Burns, 'India's Rise and the Future of the US-India Relationship', Lecture delivered at *Council on Foreign Relations*, New York, 1 June, 2010.

reassuring India by saying the US would not maintain its relations with Islamabad at the expense of New Delhi.⁵⁷

The second round Strategic Dialogue played an important role in the evolution of the Indo-US strategic partnership where a wide range of agreements were signed which included countering terrorism, cyber security, aviation safety, scientific cooperation and clean energy, women's empowerment, information sharing, and higher education. Immediately after the Strategic Dialogue meeting, Secretary Clinton's speech in Chennai acknowledged India's stake in Afghanistan and its major contribution in rebuilding Afghanistan. She praised India's 'Look East' policy and encouraged India to follow the policy of 'Act East' and 'Be East' instead of 'Look East', which was essential for further integration of the Asia-Pacific Region.⁵⁸

India's 'Look East' policy was formulated by Prime Minister Narasima Rao in the early 1990s for better economic engagement with the countries of East Asia. India, since then, has been developing economic relations with those countries and gradually turned it very successfully into a tool for forging strategic partnership and security cooperation with states of that region in general and Vietnam and Japan in particular. The 'Act East' policy should refer to more extensive engagement with those countries, developing a collective approach, which would help to bridge the gaps and bring all together in working for peace. More specifically, India's 'Act East' policy was about balancing the increasing Chinese influence in the Southeast Asian region.⁵⁹

The third round Strategic Dialogue reflected on the considerable expansion of Indo-US bilateral relations since the Strategic Dialogue was launched. The leaders pledged to further deepen the Indo-US global strategic partnership, and sketched an outline for the future course and shared security, peace, prosperity and stability. A record number of sub-dialogues have taken place, such as the Counterterrorism Joint Working Group, Cyber Consultations, the Higher Education Dialogue, the Information and

⁵⁷ K. Alan Kronstadt, Paul K. Kerr, Michael F. Martin and Bruce Vaughn, 'India-US Relations', *op.cit.*, p. 5.

⁵⁸ Persis Khambatta and Jesse Sedler, 'Update: US-India Strategic Dialogue: Progress, Problems, and Prospects', Center for Strategic and International Studies, June 11, 2012.

⁵⁹ Amb. Sudhir T. Devare, Shivali Lawale, Gauri Tiwari and Swarnakshi Luhach, *India's Look East - Act East Policy: A Bridge to the Asian Neighbourhood*, Symbiosis Institute of International Studies (SIIS), Symbiosis International University, Pune, India, 2014, p. 56.

Communications Technology Working Group, Homeland Security Consultations and the Women's Empowerment Dialogue and many other events.⁶⁰

The Strategic Dialogue was a strong sign of goodwill but it is questionable whether it had much impact on broader US policies toward India. For example, it was said many times that the US would not cultivate Pakistan in such a way as to harm India, but in reality, those statements remained rhetorical in many cases, including the Afghan war. In addition, the Strategic Dialogue did not bring about major change in US policy making on most of the issues deliberated on in its various rounds, and so its significance remained largely symbolic.

6.4.4 Obama's India Visit of 2010 – Announcement of US Support for UN Security Council Membership for India and its Impact

President Obama visited India for three days in the first week of November 2010. He was the sixth US president visit India and, most importantly, he became the first US president to visit the country in his first term. This visit was not a surprising one as he received the invitation from Prime Minister Singh one year earlier in 2009. Considering President Obama's initial stance on India's nuclear cooperation agreement, and hesitation to recognise India as a responsible rising world power, this visit was very significant.⁶¹

President Obama's visit to India came after the successful visits in 2000 by President Clinton and in 2006 by President Bush. Obama's visit was also regarded as a successful one which added content to the partnership of the Indo-US relations. The visit proved that the United States had changed its approach toward India permanently, reassuring India that the Obama administration welcomed India as a prominent rising world power, and intended to build a genuine alliance with the US. The visit showed that the administration was willing to take forward the improvement in relations that had begun during the Bush Administration. President Obama had already said he regarded the Indo-US alliance as one of the 'defining and indispensable partnerships of the 21st century' and during the visit he reiterated this sentiment and expressed his willingness

⁶⁰Joint Statement on the Third U.S.-India Strategic Dialogue, Media Note, Office of the Spokesperson, Washington DC, June 13, 2012, available at <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2012/06/192267.htm>, accessed 12 January 2016.

⁶¹Mohammad Waqas Sajjad and Mahwish Hafeez, 'President Obama in India – A 'Giant Leap Forward'?' *Strategic Studies*, the Institute of Strategic Studies, Islamabad, p.10.

to work with India to promote peace and stability in the region, and to set the rules of interaction with other countries in the world.⁶²

During the visit, while talking to students in Mumbai, Obama said that, though many people believed that India was a rising power, the US believed that India has already risen. He also said that India was taking its rightful place in Asia and in the world and the United States saw India's rise as not only good for the US but good for the entire world.⁶³ This recognition of India's rise was a key element in deepening Indo-US relations.⁶⁴

During his speech to the Indian Parliament, President Obama described the purpose of the Indo-US partnership as serving three broad areas: i) promoting prosperity for both nations through two-way investment and through greater trade; ii) preventing terror attacks through the enhancement of shared security; and iii) working to strengthen democratic governance and human rights.⁶⁵ President Obama declared his support for the inclusion of India into the Nuclear Suppliers Group along with three other multilateral export control groups. He also committed to reforming US export controls to ramp up innovative high-technology trade with India, and treating the latter as a partner country. Subsequently, in the beginning of the following year, the United States removed the Defence Research and Development Organization (DRDO) and the Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO) from the Entity List of the US Commerce Department, which facilitated dynamic cooperation on high-technology sectors.⁶⁶

The other contribution made during Obama's visit was the US announcement that it would expand and upgrade the Indo-US Nuclear Agreement Cooperation, cooperation in space and in the defence sectors as well. Obama was very supportive of India's concern about terrorism stemming from the Pakistani side.⁶⁷ He fully backed India saying: 'We will continue to insist to Pakistan's leaders that terrorist safe havens within their borders are unacceptable, and that the terrorists behind the Mumbai attacks be

⁶² Ahmad Ejaz, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

⁶³ "Remarks by the President and First Lady in Town Hall With Students in Mumbai, India," White House release, November 7, 2010.

⁶⁴ Interview with Ambassador Howard Schaffer in Washington DC, December 5, 2012.

⁶⁵ K. Alan Kronstadt, Paul K. Kerr, Michael F. Martin & Bruce Vaughn, 'India: Domestic Issues, Strategic Dynamics, and U.S. Relations', *Congressional Research Service*, September 1, 2011, p. 7.

⁶⁶ Walter Andersen & Shrey Verma, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

⁶⁷ Ahmad Ejaz, *op. cit.*, pp. 152-3.

brought to justice'.⁶⁸ The Mumbai attack, known as India's 9/11, reminded the Obama Administration of its vulnerability to global terrorism and their shared interest in struggling against extremism. President Obama also emphasised the mutual 'terrorist' insecurities of the US and India and their strategic interdependence.

The main contribution that came out of President Obama's visit to India was the US announcement of its support for India's bid for a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. Obama received loud applause from the members of the Indian Parliament for his endorsement of Indian seat in the UNSC. It was a step toward elevating India to a major power status in the world. Before that, the United States had only endorsed Japan for a permanent seat.⁶⁹ It should also be noted here that while announcing US support for India, President Obama cautioned India with the words: 'with increased power comes increased responsibility'.⁷⁰ Indicating on-going gross violations of human rights in Myanmar, and suspicions over the nuclear programme in Tehran, Obama said that it was the duty and responsibility of the international community especially India (being an emerging global power) and the US to condemn such illegal and immoral activities. In the past, India had failed to do so, shying away from the issue and this needed to change if India was to take its place in the international community.⁷¹

This historic visit and particularly the historic announcement of the US endorsement for India's permanent seat on an expanded UNSC had many effects on the region and the world as a whole. There were two different views regarding Obama's endorsement. While many US experts viewed the announcement as merely symbolic in nature and lacking substance, many Indians considered the President's promise to support India's quest for a permanent membership in the UN Security Council the highpoint of the visit. Robert Hathaway argued that since every one believed India's accession into the UNSC was not going to happen in near future, the endorsement was merely symbolic, though it carried real significance for their relations.⁷² Likewise, Lisa Curtis argued that 'from

⁶⁸Obama backs India on permanent UN Security Council seat, *BBC News*, 08 November 2010, available at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/mobile/world-south-asia-11711007>, accessed 12 March 2016.

⁶⁹K. Alan Kronstadt, Paul K. Kerr, Michael F. Martin & Bruce Vaughn, 'India: Domestic Issues, Strategic Dynamics, and U.S. Relations', *Congressional Research Service*, September 1, 2011, p. 8.

⁷⁰Remarks by the President to the Joint Session of the Indian Parliament in New Delhi, India, The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, November 08, 2010, available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2010/11/08/remarks-president-joint-session-indian-parliament-new-delhi-india>, accessed 12 March 2016.

⁷¹Mohammad Waqas Sajjad and Mahwish Hafeez, *op.cit.*, p. 14.

⁷²Interview with Robert M. Hathaway in Washington DC in December 5, 2012.

India's perspective, Obama's endorsement for India to obtain a permanent seat on an expanded UN Security Council is the most symbolically important statement he made. The reality, however, is that UN Security Council Reform is likely still years away'.⁷³

Some observers like Anthony Quinton⁷⁴ maintained that the Indian government behaved too timidly in the international arena, which did not necessarily make India qualified for a position with global responsibility. He argued that India seemed unwilling to take the kind of policy stand required from a global player especially from one with a UNSC seat. It should also be noted, however, that at the BRICs Summit of 2011, China and Russia issued a joint statement for the first time, supporting Indian, Brazilian, and South African 'aspirations to play a greater role in the UN'. Such an endorsement will not be enough however, unless a concrete step is taken by the P5 favouring reform of the Council.⁷⁵ The chances for reform of the Council still remain slim in the near future.

The offer of a UNSC seat for India certainly made Pakistan angry and created dissatisfaction in Beijing.⁷⁶ Although the US offered support for an Indian permanent seat on a reformed UNSC, these countries and others did not want to give India a veto power, and one possible compromise was that India might be given a semi-permanent seat or permanent seat without a veto power. The US offered the same to the Japanese. The United States said to India that it deserved to be in the group of the top ten, but it was not pushing hard for India, and not even pushing the reform very hard at all.⁷⁷ The US position was rhetorical.⁷⁸

Though some scholars held the view that this announcement dissatisfied China, Ambassador Quinton saw it differently, arguing that China knew that they could always veto India's admission to the UNSC. It was not a commitment to do anything; it was just the recognition of India's status. If a proposal comes to the table, China will probably veto. China was more concerned that Japan would get a permanent seat. Japan itself would not like to be surrounded by two other great powers. The United Kingdom might use its veto, along with China, against an Indian seat, as London has been in

⁷³ Mohammad Waqas Sajjad and Mahwish Hafeez, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁷⁴ Interview with Ambassador Anthony Quinton in Washington DC, December 4, 2012.

⁷⁵ K. Alan Kronstadt & Sonia Pinto 'U.S.-India Security Relations: Strategic Issues', *Congressional Research Service*, January 24, 2013, p. 37.

⁷⁶ Interview with Satu Limaye in Washington DC, December 3, 2012.

⁷⁷ Interview with Ambassador Anthony Quinton in Washington DC, December 4, 2012.

⁷⁸ Interview with Thomas Lynch in Washington DC, December 5, 2012.

favour of a permanent seat for Brazil.⁷⁹ It was a big step for India to get United States' support for its status as a global power and constructive player.⁸⁰ But reform seems very far off, as it looks like each of the permanent members has its own choice and reservation. But it is also true that if reform takes place, India is likely to be one of the powers that will gain a place.

Stephen P. Cohen and Professor Deepa were of the same opinion. Publically, the United States supported India's bid for a UN Security Council seat but realistically that was not going to happen as other countries would veto.⁸¹ The United States was giving support because it cost little for the US even though it would make Pakistan angry and China was certainly not for it. Ambassador Schaffer was of the opinion that it was very important for the United States to support India in its effort to gain a global power status. China has been ambiguous about India's seat on the UNSC on a permanent basis, and Pakistan was certainly against it. Pakistan was always against any recognition of India as global power. Basically the United States should not be worried about what Pakistan said about this issue.⁸² More important from Ambassador Quinton's perspective was that: 'We don't accept India as a global power because India does not act like a global power. India does not comport itself to be a global power'. The United States did not want India to be a global power for India's sake but because it wanted to restrain China's elevation to a global power. The United States did not want to push India to be the equal of China in the global power race but needed it to balance China's rise.⁸³

In short, whatever motive was behind the President Obama's visit to India in 2010, it was a historic moment and reflected India's emerging visibility on the world stage. The endorsement by the US was a recognition of India's rising power status. Whether and when reform of the UNSC might take place is unknown, but the announcement of US support mitigated India's concerns and improved the strained relations between India and the Obama Administration. This visit made Indo-US relations more cordial than at any time previously.

⁷⁹ Interview with Thomas Lynch in Washington DC, December 5, 2012.

⁸⁰ Interview with Ambassador Anthony Quinton in Washington DC, December 4, 2012.

⁸¹ Interview with Stephen P. Cohen and with Professor Deepa in Washington DC.

⁸² Interview with Ambassador Howard Schaffer in Washington DC, December 5, 2012.

⁸³ Interview with Ambassador Anthony Quinton in Washington DC, December 4, 2012.

6.5 Winding down the Afghan War – Impact

President Obama's intention was to continue fighting terrorism, but with a different strategy to that of President Bush, and he therefore never accepted Bush's concept of a global War on Terror. He also considered the Iraq War a war of choice, and therefore illegal under international law, and he promised to bring the war to a responsible end. Although he considered the Afghanistan War a war of necessity, he sought to wind it down as well, and planned to bring all US troops back home by 2014.

The Obama administration demonstrated flexibility and willingness to adapt in its policy toward Iraq and Afghanistan, by reconciling and adjusting previous positions stated during the campaign with the ground realities. During his campaign, Obama promised to end the Iraq War immediately, but considering the reality on the ground, he slowed down the withdrawal and finally ended it in late 2011, nine months after the date scheduled by the Bush administration and Iraqi Premier Al-Maliki.⁸⁴ It also should be noted here that, before declaring his pivot toward Asia, Obama ended the Iraq War and planned to withdraw from Afghanistan.

It was a well-known fact that the war in Afghanistan was the most difficult conflict the Obama Administration inherited. He said many times that the US did not come to Afghanistan to control the country or design the future, but to defeat Al Qaeda. When he renewed his strategy for Afghanistan and planned to withdraw US forces, he thought of strengthening the Afghan's armed forces and setting up a trust fund to ensure the sustainability of the mission. In order to strengthen and train the Afghan armed forces, the United States sent 4,000 additional US forces, so as to enable the former to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity, and fight the terrorist threat.⁸⁵

The war in Afghanistan was very expensive for the US, as it had to maintain 100,000 troops, and cost more than \$10 billion every month. Considering such a financial loss, the Obama Administration was reluctant to continue its military presence there after 2014, and started taking the necessary steps to wind down the war. To do this, it had various meetings to set up the conditions which would allow the US and NATO forces

⁸⁴Martin S. Indyk, Kenneth G. Lieberthal, and Michael E. O'Hanlon, 'Scoring Obama's Foreign Policy: A Progressive Pragmatist Tries to Bend History', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 91, No. 3, pp. 34-35.

⁸⁵ Juan Garrigues, 'Obama & Af-Pak: exit from Afghanistan, entry into Pakistan?' *FRIDE*, Comment, May 2009, p.2.

to withdraw from Afghanistan.⁸⁶ As a part of this winding down, the Obama Administration announced the withdrawal of 10,000 troops before the end of 2011, and 23,000 troops by September 2012. At the beginning of 2012, President Obama reaffirmed the deadline for withdrawal, and released a defence budget of overall reductions in US infantry forces.⁸⁷

The main objective of the United States and the Western world in Afghanistan was to prevent the country from becoming a safe haven for international terrorists, and an ally to the terrorists.⁸⁸ India had the same objective. The US and India have very strong national interests in preventing Afghanistan from being further used as a base from which terrorists can attack US and Indian interests.⁸⁹ India has traditionally maintained strong cultural and political ties with Afghanistan. For India's security, and the stability in the region, New Delhi has hugely invested in Afghanistan ever since the declaration of war in Afghanistan in 2001. New Delhi invested in various sectors, including development projects, humanitarian assistance, and nation-building.⁹⁰ India became one of the leading contributors to the reconstruction of Afghan infrastructure. India's extensive assistance programme covered almost all areas of development in Afghanistan. New Delhi opened a number of consulates there and has declared itself 'committed to the unity, integrity and independence of Afghanistan underpinned by democracy and cohesive pluralism and free from external interference'.⁹¹ India has committed some \$1.3 billion for the overall development of Afghanistan.⁹²

The Obama Administration realised that New Delhi could play a vital role in ensuring peace and stability in Afghanistan as bilateral ties between them spanned centuries. Given the eternal rivalry between India and Pakistan, New Delhi had every reason to

⁸⁶ Harsh V. Pant, 'India in Afghanistan: A Trajectory in Motion', *Jadavpur Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 17, No. 1, 2013, p. 120.

⁸⁷ Dana H. Allin & Erik Jones, Chapter Two: Barack Obama and the limits of superpower, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-6.

⁸⁸ James Dobbins & James Shinn, 'Afghanistan: Guidelines for a Peace Process', *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy*, Vol. 53, No.4, 2011, p. 5.

⁸⁹ Robert D. Blackwill and Naresh Chandra, 'The United States and India: A Shared Strategic Future', *Joint Study Group Report*, Council on Foreign Relations and ASPEN Institute India, September 2011, p. 17.

⁹⁰ Harsh V. Pant, 'India in Afghanistan: A Trajectory in Motion', *op. cit.*, p. 103.

⁹¹ Statement by Dr. Kakoli Ghosh Dastidar, Member of Parliament, on Situation in Afghanistan at the 65th Session of the United Nations General Assembly on November 04, 2010, available at <https://www.pminewyork.org/adminpart/uploadpdf/90307ind1791.pdf>, accessed 12 March 2016.

⁹² K. Alan Kronstadt, Paul K. Kerr, Michael F. Martin and Bruce Vaughn, 'India-US Relations', *CRS Report for Congress*, Congressional Research Service, 2010, p. 12.

play a significant role in Afghanistan.⁹³ When the question of US troop withdrawal surfaced, and President Obama expressed his intention of avoiding a prolonged presence of US forces in Afghanistan, to ensure a smooth exit for the US military, he tried a reconciliation effort with insurgents, which made India nervous.⁹⁴ India was concerned about the possible chaos that might ensue, and the potential return of the Taliban regime. The desire of some in the US to appease Islamabad at the cost of New Delhi and Kabul made India more concerned.⁹⁵ It was also predicted that the two eternal rivals, India and Pakistan might be fighting proxy war inside the country with spies.

The announcement of the US military withdrawal left India at a crossroads, as it wanted to preserve its interests in Afghanistan.⁹⁶ The exit of US forces from Afghanistan has limited the opportunity for India to preserve and protect its interests, and naturally restrained its ability to strengthen India's 'Indo-Pacific' outlook beyond the region. This announcement has necessarily led India to increased and accelerated efforts to have new strategic ties with Kabul, and to strengthen its position so as to influence peace negotiations between the Afghan government and the Taliban. In the autumn of 2012, India signed a strategic partnership agreement with Afghanistan, in which it committed to guaranteeing stability in Afghanistan once foreign forces departed.⁹⁷ The announcement also made India anxious about its partnership with the United States, and increased the concern that it did not pay adequate attention to India and India's security. The Obama Administration has tried to ease India's worries by assuring it that India has a legitimate role to play in Afghanistan. Again during 2012, the US took significant steps to reassure New Delhi that it was not planning to abandon Afghanistan. Rather, it has signed a strategic partnership with Kabul and encouraged India's strategic agreement with Afghanistan.⁹⁸

The biggest worry for India was whether Afghanistan can control the Taliban and what role Islamabad would play. India was totally unconvinced that Afghanistan would be ready to assume full responsibility for the security of their country, and India's nightmare was that Islamabad would facilitate the movement which would lead to

⁹³ Harsh V. Pant, 'India in Afghanistan: A Trajectory in Motion', *op. cit.*, p. 106.

⁹⁴ Ashley J. Tellis, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-5.

⁹⁵ Harsh V. Pant, 'Modi's Unexpected Boost to India-U.S. Relations', *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 37, No. 3, 2014, p. 98.

⁹⁶ Harsh V. Pant, 'India in Afghanistan: A Trajectory in Motion', *op. cit.*, p. 106.

⁹⁷ Walter Andersen & Shrey Verma, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁹⁸ K. Alan Kronstadt & Sonia Pinto 'U.S.-India Security Relations: Strategic Issues', *Congressional Research Service*, January 24, 2013, p. 41.

terrorist attacks on its territory and make the region unstable.⁹⁹ If things were to worsen after the US withdrawal, then the US relationship would be much stronger with Pakistan which would be another major concern for New Delhi.¹⁰⁰ India's desire to play a greater role in the Asia-Pacific would largely depend on its ability to appear as a dominant regional power and deepen its relations with neighbours. Therefore, the normalisation of relations with Pakistan, and its ability to establish stability in Afghanistan in the post-withdrawal period remain key challenges for New Delhi.¹⁰¹

If we critically look at the Afghan problem, it became clear that Afghanistan has been a serious difficulty for Indo-US relations. The dilemma for the US was that it could be close to have Pakistan or India but it was not realistic to have both on the issue. India was important to the US for the Middle East and Asia, and Pakistan was important for Afghanistan. But in practice the situation in Afghanistan pushed the US towards Pakistan and marginalising India even though in broader regional terms it was clear the US wanted to cultivate India. It has struggled to balance these competing pressures.

6.6 Counterbalancing the Chinese Rise

Obama's policy toward Asia has been wrapped up in the rise of China and its strategic assertion in the Asia-Pacific, and America's response to this. The Obama administration since the beginning of its term looked for active engagement with Asia. It has been trying to improve its ties and relations with friends and allies in the region. Having realised China's growing importance in the present world, the Obama Administration also wanted to improve relations with Beijing on bilateral, regional and global issues. In spite of the US concentrated effort to work closely with Beijing, relations were not entirely cordial.¹⁰² It has not been forgotten that they fought a brutal and deadly war on the Korean Peninsula a mere six decades ago. Although they have become closer on several issues, particularly on terror since 9/11, neither considers each other a 'real friend'. Interestingly, they have been following a policy of pretending to be friends in

⁹⁹Teresita C. Schaffer, 'India and its South Asian Neighbors: Where does the U.S. fit in?', in *The Second Modi-Obama Summit: Building the India-US Partnership*, Brookings India Initiative, January 2015, p. 8.

¹⁰⁰ Interview with Thomas Farr in Washington DC, December 6, 2012.

¹⁰¹Walter Andersen & Shrey Verma, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

¹⁰²Martin S. Indyk, Kenneth G. Lieberthal, and Michael E. O'Hanlon, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

their bilateral relations¹⁰³ and avoided any major deterioration, reflecting the maturity of the leadership and their desire to keep disagreements within limits.

After 9/11, with the Chinese support for counterterrorism, the US started to no longer see China as a rival but a partner or a responsible stakeholder. Like President Bush, President Obama sought a ‘positive, cooperative, and comprehensive’ US relationship with China, and also asked China to play a role as a responsible stakeholder. It was interesting, however, that the Obama Administration continued to have the same ‘two-pronged strategy’ as pursued by the Bush Administration. The two-pronged strategy was such that the US was seeking more Chinese cooperation in asserting China as a responsible stakeholder in the world, and, at the same time, wanted to contain Chinese power by maintaining a US presence in the region.¹⁰⁴

From the beginning of his second year in office, Obama reaffirmed the importance of the US’s Asian allies, saying that ‘we are here to stay’, and Secretary Clinton made it even clearer in a speech in Hawaii, saying that the United States planned to continue playing a leading role in the regional architecture of Asia.¹⁰⁵ Although the Obama Administration has often said that its moves were not directed toward any particular country, observers believed that at least in part moves were aimed to counter China’s growing influence.¹⁰⁶

Since every US policy was seen by China as part of a sophisticated conspiracy against China’s rise, the US pivot toward Asia was also seen through this lens by China. But at the official level, China responded to this US policy shift toward the region very cautiously. In February 2012, Chinese Vice President Xi during his visit to the US said: ‘China welcomes a constructive role by the United States in promoting peace, stability and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific, while, at the same time, we hope the United States will respect the interests and concerns of China and other countries in this region’.¹⁰⁷ The United States argued that China’s perception of every US policy being directed toward an effort to frustrate Chinese growing influence was a simplistic reading of US

¹⁰³ De-Yuan Kao, ‘China Policy’, in Robert P. Watson, Jack Covarrubias, Tom Lansford and M. Brattebo (Eds.), *The Obama Presidency: A Preliminary Assessment*, Suny Press, State University of New York, 2012, p. 267.

¹⁰⁴ Mayang A. Rahawestri, *op. cit.*, pp.111-2.

¹⁰⁵ De-Yuan Kao, *op. cit.*, 2012, p. 268.

¹⁰⁶ Mark E. Manyin, Stephen Daggett, Ben Dolven, Susan V. Lawrence, et. al, ‘Pivot to the Pacific? The Obama Administration’s ‘Rebalancing’ Toward Asia’, *CRS Report for Congress*, Congressional Research Service, March 28, 2012, p. 8.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

foreign policy. The US rebalancing policy was driven and directed by a broader set of strategic, political, and economic considerations not to counterbalance against a Chinese rise; this policy was the US grand strategy of Obama's foreign policy.¹⁰⁸ The Obama Administration was also very much mindful that virtually every other country in the region desired the US to counterbalance the Chinese rapid rise, but none wanted to choose between two great powers.¹⁰⁹

Both the US and India have relationships with China, and each has a different approach toward engagement. Their relationships with China have varied, depending on the situation and issues; both of them have elements of cooperation and potential conflict, competition and collaboration. Each knows that a good relationship between the US and India, would send the wrong signal to China, but none of them wanted to antagonise China, and choosing China at the cost of their own bilateral relationship was also not realistic. Both became concerned when the question arose of China's role in the Asia-Pacific, and both remained uncertain and suspicious of each other's intentions.¹¹⁰

The United States recognised India, China, and the US itself as the great players in Asia and they will continue to be so. At the same time, however, it was also in the interests of the US to ensure that India was considered a key player in US strategy. As committed to democracy and the rule of law, India would remain a model of development for the developing world.¹¹¹ The United States as a world power had to balance its relations with China and India. The Obama Administration wanted India and China to succeed as they were major markets,¹¹² but Professor Deepa Ollapally was of the opinion that Obama was not looking in purely in geopolitical terms; he had a more complex view. India was going to be primarily a partner, a hedge against China, and not a player in its own right.¹¹³

Both the US and India were engaged in a hedging system involving China and Japan. The hedging strategy was designed to keep all players in the system. The United States and Japan were strategically closer and it was their shared interests to build an

¹⁰⁸Robert G. Sutter, Michael E. Brown, and Timothy J. A. Adamson, with Mike M. Mochizuki and Deepa Ollapally, *Balancing Acts: The U.S. Rebalance and Asia-Pacific Stability*, Elliot School of International Affairs and Sigar Centre for Asian Studies of The George Washington University, August 2013, p. 1.

¹⁰⁹Martin S. Indyk, Kenneth G. Lieberthal, and Michael E. O'Hanlon, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

¹¹⁰Tanvi Madan, 'The U.S.-India Relationship and China', in *The Second Modi-Obama Summit: Building the India-US Partnership*, Brookings India Initiative, January 2015, p. 13.

¹¹¹Walter Andersen & Shrey Verma, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

¹¹²Interview with Satu Limaye in Washington DC, December 3, 2012.

¹¹³Interview with Deepa Ollapally in Washington DC, December 6, 2012.

economically vibrant and militarily strong India to play an effective role in balancing Asia.¹¹⁴ When the Obama Administration announced a new era of engagement in its foreign policy, it necessarily indicated to China that the US wanted to counterbalance the Chinese rise. Lisa Curtis also argued that both India and the US were trying to contain China's rise, citing private dialogue between the two governments. Secretary Clinton has clearly stated that the US wanted to see India play an active and greater role in East Asia, counterbalancing the rapid rise of Chinese military strength and economic capacity. India responded carefully to such a desire and showed that it did not want to contain China.¹¹⁵

Since India sought access to Western technologies and investments, and the US wanted to counter China's rapid rise and global influence, both the US's and India's interests converged in developing a global strategic partnership. India was hesitant about attempting to contain China, and, instead, Indian strategists argued that India should pacify China. India's doubt was over whether it would benefit from close relations with the US if the latter's presence in the Pacific delayed the expansion of Chinese maritime power in the Indian Ocean.¹¹⁶ Policy makers in New Delhi argued it would be risky for New Delhi to be too heavily depending on the US as the Indo-US partnership 'could become a casualty of any technical upswing in Sino-American ties'.¹¹⁷ They argued that it could threaten India's interests, reducing its influence to a secondary role. They therefore framed their own complex strategic responses to adjust to uncertainty, centring on rising China.¹¹⁸ India never wanted to be seen as allied with the US and following a containment strategy against China. In New Delhi's perception, India might be put into a highly vulnerable position when the US took the initiative to accommodate China at the cost of the other smaller power in the region.¹¹⁹ On the other hand, the Chinese were more cautious and concerned over the growing US strategic partnership with

¹¹⁴Walter Andersen & Shrey Verma, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

¹¹⁵Lisa Curtis, 'Going the Extra Mile for a Strategic US-India Relationship', *op. cit.*, p.4.

¹¹⁶ Sunil Khilani, Rajiv Kumar, Pratap Bhanu, Lt Gen (Rtd) Prakash Menon, Nandan Nilkeni, Srinath Ragwan, Shyam Saran, and Siddharth Varadrjan, 'Non-alignment 2.0: A Foreign Policy for India in the Twenty First Century', 2012, at http://www.cprindia.org/sites/default/files/NonAlignment%2020_1pdf.

¹¹⁷Lisa Curtis, 'China's Rise and India's Obvious Partner (the US)', *The Daily Signal*, March 05, 2012, available at <http://dailysignal.com/2012/03/05/concerns-about-china-should-strengthen-indo-u-s-ties/>, accessed March 12, 2016.

¹¹⁸Yogesh Joshi, 'Reluctant India, Rising China and Alliance Politics in the Asia-Pacific', *East-West Centre Asia Pacific Bulletin*, No. 162, April 26, 2012.

¹¹⁹ Harsh V. Pant and Yogesh Joshi, 'The American "Pivot" And The Indian Navy: It's Hedging All the Way', *Naval War College Review*, Winter 2015, Vol. 68, No. 1, p. 64.

India, and China expressed its uneasiness over such alignments in the region that could encircle China.¹²⁰

The main concern on India's part was that the United States considered India as a means to achieve its goal vis-à-vis China. The US did not show its inclination to concentrate on issues that India actually wanted assistance with. India did not have history of alliances against any power, rather they have a strong history of non-alignment and was not interested to join any US led alliance against China. This left room for cooperation short of an alliance. As Ambassador Howard Schaffer argued, the United States believed there should be a number of power centres in Asia. The US was therefore less interested in developing an alliance with India against China than in welcoming, it would welcome India as an active player in the international arena and one of the dominant powers in Asia, as the second or third strongest country after China and perhaps Japan.¹²¹

6.7 Inauguration of Modi and the Obama Administration

The timeline of the current thesis was set out as US policy after 9/11 until the first term of the Obama presidency, but there has been a great change in India under Modi's leadership and a lot has changed during his short period in power. US relations with India under the Obama Administration in its first term have been seen to have followed an upward trend despite some initial strains and superficial ups and downs. In another backward step in 2013 we have seen the pattern continue with the strain in the Indo-US relationship caused by the expulsion of India's diplomat Debjani for her illegal and non-diplomatic actions.

When Narendra Modi was elected as Prime minister of India, worries and concerns have been expressed in India and the US as to how the Indo-US relations will be under his leadership. Modi was refused permission to enter the US for a long time due to his aggressive Hindu nationalism and the accusations that he was complicit in religiously motivated killings against Indian Muslims. When he assumed power, he took various positive steps to create an image of himself as a tolerant leader of a great democracy, and continued the policy of developing Indo-US relations. He mitigated the Indo-US strains caused by Debjani case and restored relations to normality.

¹²⁰ See 'Stabilize South Asia', *Harvard International Review*, Winter 2010.

¹²¹ Interview with Ambassador Howard Schaffer in Washington DC, December 5, 2012.

As his goodwill gesture, Modi had two summit-level meetings within four months of becoming Prime Minister. He invited President Obama to attend India's Republic Day which was a huge indication of Modi's intention of making Indo-US relation better than ever. Despite the US previously refusing him a visa, when Modi came to power he made his intention clear that he wanted to have a different level of partnership with the US, falsifying the expectation that Indo-US relations would worsen if he was elected as Prime Minister of India.¹²²

As a great sign of his intention to take the Indo-US relations to a different level, a hotline was established between India and the US during President Obama's historic visit to India on India's Republic day on 26 January 2015. This has a great significance, as the US has established such a hotline with only three other countries: Russia, the UK and China. It was also significant for India, as it was India's first state-to-state hotline. India established a hotline with Pakistan in 2004 at the level of foreign minister, and with China in 2010 which has not yet become operational.¹²³ Obama said: 'We've elevated our ties. We've committed ourselves to a new partnership between our two countries. And there's been excellent follow-through on a whole range of issues'.¹²⁴

Some scholars were of the opinion before Modi's election that, if Modi was elected, Indo-US relations would be worsened. Another group saw differently, as the US would be maintaining relations with India not personally with Modi. Modi would be treated as an elected representative of more than 1000 million people.¹²⁵ Therefore, the US cannot ignore Modi, irrespective of his past actions, but must maintain the trajectory of improving Indo-US relations. The future Indo-US relations under Modi will show how, and how far he will be successful in taking their relationship to a different level.

¹²²C. Raja Mohan, 'India-U.S. Relations: Modi and Obama Begin New Chapter', Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, available at <http://carnegieendowment.org/2015/01/29/india-us-relations-modi-and-obama-begin-new-chapter>, accessed on 10 November 2015.

¹²³'Narendra Modi-Barack Obama hotline becomes operational', *The Indian Express*, 15 August 2015, available at <http://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-others/narendra-modi-barack-obama-hotline-becomes-operational/> accessed on 10 November 2015.

¹²⁴Remarks by President Obama and Prime Minister Modi of India After Bilateral Meeting at United Nations Headquarters New York, New York, 28 September 2015, available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/09/28/remarks-president-obama-and-prime-minister-modi-india-after-bilateral> accessed on 10 November 2015.

¹²⁵Interviews with scholars in Washington DC.

6.8 Conclusion

From the beginning of the present century, it has become evident that US relations with India have entered into a new phase of engagement, in which both sides persistently sought to foster expanded cooperation. The US supported India's rise in many ways, encouraging India to play a major role in maintaining the security and stability of the region. The Obama Administration also sought to carry on the same kind of engagement and cooperation with India as sought by his predecessors though with varying degrees of success.

Undoubtedly, there was a great hope in the minds of the US population and elsewhere in the world that Obama's campaign rhetoric would come true. People around the world desired a fundamental shift in US approaches to the issues of the time, as Obama himself promised. But to the contrary, there were a lot of worries and concerns arose among Indian policy-makers, who initially wondered whether the Obama Administration would undo what the Bush Administration painstakingly constructed during his two terms. India was very much concerned by Obama's policies to China and Pakistan, as they threatened to decrease India's influence if China was the centrepiece of Obama's policy, and India's security would seriously be threatened as Pakistan was given priority because it might lead to an interventionist approach to the Kashmir dispute. The US did not initially emphasise its bilateral relations with India, and the possibility arose that India might pursue protectionist economic policies which could badly damage bilateral trade also in both goods and services.¹²⁶ The early miscalculations or missteps taken by President Obama left a marked impression on the minds of Indians because they felt that either Obama had intentionally ignored India or paid attention to India later than when it was needed, seeing India as a tool by which to solve US problems rather than as a full strategic partner.¹²⁷

Obama was progressive where possible and pragmatic when needed. Overall, he proved himself more of pragmatist.¹²⁸ The United States quickly corrected the initial mistakes made under his presidency and made Indo-US relations more cordial and co-operative. India's concerns were mitigated when he visited India in late 2010 with a large number

¹²⁶ K. Alan Kronstadt, Paul K. Kerr, Michael F. Martin and Bruce Vaughn, 'India-US Relations', *CRS Report for Congress*, Congressional Research Service, 2010, p.2.

¹²⁷ Ashley J. Tellis, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-5.

¹²⁸ Martin S. Indyk, Kenneth G. Lieberthal, and Michael E. O'Hanlon, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

of business delegates, and announced US support for an Indian permanent seat on the UNSC, calling Indo-US relations a defining partnership of the 21st century, and encouraging India to pursue an 'Act East' policy instead of a 'Look East' policy. Other than the security issue, President Obama emphasised the importance of enhancing cooperation in numerous fields, including economic trade, education, health, green partnerships, people-to-people contact, climate change, and women's empowerment¹²⁹ and described India as 'an anchor of stability in a critical part of the world.'¹³⁰

After a haltering start Obama promoted the relationship with India on a comprehensive basis. This was commensurate with his view of the evolution of an international system in which Asia would become the centre of gravity in world affairs, where the Indo-Pacific would therefore become the region in which US interests required stability above all, and the area in which India could contribute to stability and the embedding of democratic values.

¹²⁹Runa Das, 'The United States–India Nuclear Relations after 9/11: Alternative Discourses', *Asian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 2012, p. 93.

¹³⁰Philip J. Crowley, Assistant Secretary, Daily Press Briefing, State Department, Washington, DC, September 8, 2010, available at <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2010/09/146914.htm#INDIA>, accessed 16 February 2016.

CHAPTER - SEVEN

Conclusion

This concluding chapter touches upon the themes which have been demonstrated throughout the chapters of the thesis to show that the US relations with India after 9/11 have been a gradual development that has followed an upward trajectory. The chapter will also assess Indo-US relations under the two administrations by comparing the similarities and contrasts of their policies. This study set out to investigate why India became so important to the US and how the US tried to develop its relations with India, particularly after the 9/11 attack. In fact, it was not the 9/11 that made the major difference as Indo-US relations have been developing significantly since the end of the Cold War, albeit with various ups and downs. The end of the Cold War gave an opportunity for both democracies to become closer because of a combination of globalisation and India's policy of economic reforms. 9/11 created a conducive environment for, and played a role in accelerating, the process but India and the US's close partnership and current strong relationship has arisen in response to the realities of power shifts in the 21st century, one consequence of which has been to place India at the heart of US grand strategy.

Chapters Summary

The current chapter now will try to summing up various points discussed in each chapter to substantiate the main argument of the thesis.

In Chapter I, it was demonstrated that from time immemorial India has been important to the world powers, and in the 21st century, India's growing importance in the changed international political scenario has become important to the United States not only for its geo-strategic location but also for its rising economic growth.

In Chapter II, I tried to illustrate the various ups and downs of Indo-US relations since the two states resumed official relations in 1947 until the end of the Cold War, and how they were affected by superpower rivalry. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, I also attempted to show how the US, as the only remaining superpower, took the initiative to recognise India's importance, and how President Clinton's leadership laid the foundation for better US relations with India, already a regional superpower.

Chapter III demonstrated how President Bush changed his foreign policy and became more aggressive throughout his presidency, despite his initial promise that the US would follow a humble foreign policy and not appear as an arrogant nation. The chapter explained how the US changed its tone after 9/11, as the attacks changed the political contours and how the neo-cons exploited 9/11 to be aggressive in their attitude to the outside world. Initially, they viewed 9/11 as a crusade but later corrected it, so as to avoid aggravating the Muslim world. They used 9/11 as an excuse to attack Iraq and Afghanistan. Although 9/11 has not changed everything, it did change US policy significantly, and provided the Bush Administration with a great opportunity to materialize its pre-conceived agenda. In the immediate aftermath of the attack the entire world, even Iran, stood beside the US but President Bush did not capitalize on this and instead sought to reorder the world through the policy of unilateralism, shunning the option of using the soft power of persuasion.

The chapter also showed how the rise of China made the US more interested in India, and caused Bush to pursue a more proactive pattern of cooperation in developing US relations with India. Where Clinton perceived India as a potential destabilizer in the non-proliferation issue, Bush kept the issue on the backburner, and incorporated India as a constructive and positive player in overall Asian security. Bush no longer perceived India as being of less value than China, and wanted to put India in its right place in the international system, extending a hand as a strategic partner. Bush followed the policy of de-hyphenation in regarding to US relations with India and Pakistan. The chapter also showed how 9/11 trauma gave an impetus to take Indo-US relations on an upward trajectory, and provided them with an additional common interest in combating terrorism. The chapter also tried to show how the Bush Administration was different in its second term compared to the first term in its policy toward India. During the first term of the Bush Administration, India was not paid much substantive attention although they championed India in rhetorical terms. Relations with India suffered as the US was preoccupied with 9/11 agenda and war in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Chapter IV showed how the Bush Administration has implemented the neo-cons' agenda of regime change, ignoring other countries' national interests in following the policy of unilateralism – the 'go it alone' policy. The chapter clearly demonstrated how the Bush Administration implemented Bush's policy thinking in relation to India throughout his eight years of presidency. It tried to show how the Indo-US relationship

was advanced further by the efforts of the leaders of the two countries, recognising India as a responsible world power through the culmination of the historic Indo-US Nuclear Deal. The Administration proved that in a changed 21st century, Indo-US relations were not based on any temporary consideration, but rather the long-term national interest of the two states converged. Bush's first term was preoccupied by the consequences of 9/11, and his invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan, but Bush nevertheless retained an understanding that of the importance of developing the Indo-US relationship into a partnership, in particular because of the strategic implications of the rise of China

The chapter demonstrated how the US and India continued to build the relationship, taking lessons learned from the first term through defence cooperation, and by undertaking joint military exercises, special-forces training, and arms sales. In implementing their shared vision, the US introduced the NSSP, which was a milestone in their strategic partnership, and demonstrated clearly that they had escaped from Cold War perspectives. Their trade and economic cooperation increased by 700%. In a sentence, although President Bush could not improve America's positive image worldwide, he developed a success story in Indo-US relations by the end of his presidency.

Chapter V explained Obama's conceptual thinking toward US foreign policy and sought an answer to the question of whether the Obama Administration was different from that of its predecessor, as he promised to bring change and regain the US image worldwide that had been lost during the Bush Administration. The chapter discussed how Obama reshaped US foreign policy, recognising US relative decline, and facing the challenges of deep economic recession. It explained how he managed the Bush legacies as he had to struggle with the two wars he had inherited. His main goal was to restore US moral supremacy and legitimacy.

The chapter also demonstrated how he wanted and declared a new global order of a nuclear-free world, emphasising a changed relationship with Asia that would focus on China, nuclear disarmament, and non-proliferation. Obama also aimed to replace the US's strained relationship with the Muslim world with one of cooperation, and wanted to maintain a good relationship with all the major powers including its erstwhile enemy – Russia. The chapter also explained how Obama was different from Bush when it came to fighting terrorism, and how he was very clear about terrorists and Islamists. He was

very much focussed on the Afghan war and tried engaging the Taliban in resolving the problem. Initially, Obama tried engaging Iran but when this proved fruitless, he chose to pressure Iran. He followed the policy of leading from behind and emphasised using soft power. It discussed at what point he announced the US pivot toward Asia, and India's place in that setting.

Chapter VI attempted to demonstrate how, and how far, President Obama has been able to implement his world views, especially toward India. As Obama believed the US had lost influence in world affairs, he was trying to gain more friends and allies particularly in Asia to check China's rise. At the beginning of his Administration, Indo-US relations lost their momentum, as President Obama was paying more attention to China. The chapter also highlighted the factors responsible for the initial strained relations between them and later how they improved them, taking them on an upward trajectory, identifying fields of mutual cooperation and engagement, and acting accordingly. The chapter showed how Premier Manmohan Singh's visit to the US in November 2009, the subsequent visit by Obama in 2010 to India, and his commitment to supporting an India permanent seat to a reformed UNSC, improved Indo-US relations.

It also discussed how the strategic dialogue introduced by the Obama Administration contributed to develop Indo-US relations in various fields. This included Obama's decision to give a go-ahead to the nuclear agreement signed by the Bush Administration. The chapter also outlined Obama's policy of winding down the Afghan war, and the possible impact this would have on India and Indo-US bilateral relations.

Comparison of Bush and Obama's General Conceptual Approaches

As we have seen, President Obama has fundamentally different worldviews from those of President Bush. While President Bush came to office with a foreign policy influenced by neoconservatives, President Obama assumed office believing in liberal internationalism¹, reaching out to international institutions showing a more co-operative

¹Liberal internationalism, critics called liberal interventionism, emerged as an ideology during the 19th century. Notable politicians and philosophers who supported early versions included British Prime Minister Palmerston, John Bright, Richard Cobden, Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer. It was later developed under President Wilson during the first quarter of the 20th century. It is a foreign policy doctrine aiming to obtain a global structure within the existing international system with a view of promoting a world order where a market economy, including free trade, and a democratic polity would be encouraged. It is an approach based on the belief not only of the superiority of liberal democracy as a social system, but also that international peace and progress are best achieved through the spreading of this social system across the world. Critically it also argues that those states who enjoy the benefits of

attitude toward other actors. Accordingly, Obama's policies toward other countries varied according to different issues in international politics. When Obama assumed power, although he followed the same policy as his predecessor on a number of issues, he formulated new and distinct policies on others.

President Obama avoided the belligerent approach of the Bush Administration, unless the security of the country was directly threatened. From the beginning, he was against the use of force and chose a winding down policy instead of escalation in the War on Terror as it had greatly damaged the US image abroad and posed a challenge to its credibility.² Obama gave up using the term 'War on Terror' but continued fighting terrorism for example by authorising drone attacks in Pakistan aimed at destroying Al-Qaeda and the Taliban network.

The Obama Administration was trying to create a system of multilateralism, instead of the unilateralism promoted by the Bush Administration. His emphasis in US foreign policy was on 'a marriage of principles and pragmatism' and 'cooperative engagement'.³ Dialogues and negotiations were preferred by his Administration as important instruments for resolving any conflict or differences even in the most difficult situations of international conflict. The US relations with the Muslim world reached a record low during the Bush Administration. The Obama Administration tried to repair the damage, and restored relations. He very clearly stated that the US was not an enemy of Muslims or Islam.

There were differences of views between President Bush and President Obama regarding the nuclear issue. Obama believed in a nuclear-free world, and was in favour of reducing nuclear stockpiles gradually with the aim of eventually eliminating all existing nuclear arsenals.⁴ President Obama tried to lead the world by deeds and

liberal democracy have a duty to act to promote that spread in competition with tyrannical or totalitarian alternatives. The preferred means for achieving peace and progress are diplomacy and aid but intervention by force, even in the internal affairs of independent countries, cannot be ruled out as a last resort in the face of aggression by anti-liberal forces. The preferred approach is multilateral but in some versions more influenced by realism a more unilateralist approach to promote freedom and liberty is countenanced.

²Fawaz A. Gerges, *Obama and the Middle East: The End of America's Moment?* Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, p. 111.

³Hilary Clinton, Nomination Hearing To Be Secretary of State, *Statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee*, January 13, 2009, available at <http://www.state.gov/secretary/20092013clinton/rm/2009a/01/115196.htm>, accessed 6 March 2016.

⁴Brandon C. Prins and Allan Wilford, 'US Leadership in Post 9/11 World: Comparing World Views and Foreign Policy Decisions of George W. Bush and Barack Obama', *Policy Brief*, 1:14, Fall 2013, The Howard H. Baker Centre for Public Policy, pp. 6-10.

examples, not by force or dictates. Therefore, another clear difference between the Obama and the Bush Administration concerns the promotion of democracy. While the Bush Administration believed that spreading democracy would make America safer and he made it a central part of American strategy, Obama believed that countries should work together on the basis of common interests and not on the basis of a common type of government.⁵ The Bush Administration policy toward China was tough at the beginning but became softer later. In contrast, Obama was softer and accommodating in his first years toward China but made changes in late 2009 that showed a much more conservative attitude.⁶

Despite using rhetoric about creating an extensive change in policies, Obama has, in reality, shown a substantial degree of continuity with his predecessor. Obama's NSS of 2010 was the continuation of Bush's NSS of 2006, where both emphasised American leadership. Obama realised, however, that the United States was no longer an indispensable nation but rather an indispensable leader.⁷ During the campaign, he emphasised the need to pursue a smarter and less hawkish policy than President Bush in foreign relations, but when he assumed power he did not fundamentally change overall military spending. He rather increased defence spending in his first two years, slightly reduced it in his third year, and again increased it in the final year of his first term.⁸

While Obama has rejected many neoconservative policies, he did not hesitate to adopt a number of realist policies from the past Republican administrations of Bush Sr., Eisenhower, and Nixon. At the same time, he has continued many policy initiatives introduced by the Bush Administration in foreign affairs. His foreign policy approach was not a wholesale transformation but a hybrid of old and new.⁹

⁵ Daniel S. Morey, Clayton L. Thyne, Sarah L. Hayden & Michael B. Senters, 'Leader, Follower, or Spectator? The Role of President Obama in the Arab Spring Uprising', *Social Science Quarterly*, Volume 93, Number 5, December 2012, p.1189.

⁶ De-Yuan Kao, 'China Policy', in Robert P. Watson, Jack Covarrubias, Tom Lansford and M. Brattebo (Eds.), *The Obama Presidency: A Preliminary Assessment*, Suny Press, State University of New York, 2012, p. 264.

⁷ 'Preserve Rule of Law': Obama's Inauguration Letter to Trump Revealed, *the Guardian*, 4 September 2017.

⁸ Brandon C. Prins & Allan Wilford, US Leadership in a Post 9/11 World: Comparing World Views and Foreign Policy Decisions of George W. Bush and Barack Obama, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-10.

⁹ Lawrence J. Korb and Laura Conley, 'Fighting Two Wars', in Andrew J. Dowdle, Dirk C. Van Raemdonck and Robert Maranto (ed.), *The Obama Presidency: Change and Continuity*, Routledge, New York and London, 2011, pp. 172-3.

President Obama has been subject to severe criticism by those who found a contradiction between his rhetoric and his practice. People around the world thought that he would be very different from President Bush but in reality he showed less difference than many anticipated. He used to say that he was against any regime change, but regime change was precisely what he pursued in Libya. Critics like Tariq Ali, however, in his book *The Obama Syndrome: Surrender at Home, War Abroad*, argued that there has been no real break in US policies under Obama, that the 'change we believe in' has meant no change at all¹⁰. Even some analysts like Niall Ferguson accused him of saying one thing in public but doing another when in action.¹¹ Professor Inderjeet Parmar branded him a more militarist president than Bush. Obama was different in rhetoric, but less so in action, partly because he wanted to keep some favourable legacies like enhancing the relationship with Japan, China, and India and the six party talks in dealing with the nuclear programme of North Korea.

President Obama used American power in a smarter, more acceptable way than President Bush. Bush was expansionist and more assertive whereas Obama became adaptive. Many presidents found themselves pursuing a foreign policy that has more continuity than change, and in Obama's case the continuity was more striking and has mostly worked.

Assessment of the Similarities and Contrasts in their Approaches to India

President Bush openly recognised India as a major global power in the 21st century, and he made India a *de facto* nuclear power through Indo-US nuclear cooperation and lifted sanctions imposed after 1998's nuclear test. President Obama was also quite supportive, like President Bush, of India as an emerging world power. The Bush Administration in its first term was very much occupied with 9/11 events and its consequent wars, and paid less attention to India, but in second term the administration took India seriously, the best evidence for which was the culmination of nuclear deal. Likewise, the Obama Administration in its initial period was less enthusiastic to India and was busy with China, but later ultimately corrected his stance and took the Indo-US relationship on an upward trajectory.

¹⁰Tariq Ali, *The Obama Syndrome: Surrender at Home, War Abroad*, Verso, London, 2010. pp. 73,113.

¹¹Fawaz A. Gerges, *Obama and the Middle East: The End of America's Moment? op. cit.*, p.91.

When Obama came to power, questions were raised in India over whether he would continue the same policies as Bush. On many issues in international politics, Obama has pursued the same policy as the previous administration from the beginning, but in India's case it was different. The height of the US relationship with India under the Bush Administration was disrupted in the first year of Obama's Administration. In his first year, President Obama did not pay due attention to India in continuing the policies of the Bush Administration. President Obama was not ready to carry on his predecessor's policies with same vigour, and India hardly figured in his priority list. Instead, an attempt was made to bracket India along with Afghanistan and Pakistan in a so called Af-Pak strategy. While the Bush Administration tried to achieve a balanced relationship with India and Pakistan, the Obama Administration gave priority to Pakistan due to its role in fighting global terrorism, especially in Afghanistan. In a word, the Obama administration was less enthusiastic toward India in the beginning, and Pakistan along with China occupied a central place in his foreign policy in the region.

Dr. Limaye argued that in the beginning, the Obama Administration was less enthusiastic toward India, and China was the centrepiece of its policy toward the region.¹² A number of reasons could be mentioned here for Obama's indifferent attitude to India. In Obama's view, India posed no threat to the US interests. India was not a signatory to the NPT or CTBT and was not engaged in the production of WMDs. India was in no way a perpetrator of terrorism, but rather was a victim of terrorism. Probably, the most important reason America showed little interest in India, was that India's economy was not so large that it could affect the US economy during the 2008 recession. Finally, though India was committed to playing its role in fighting terrorism, its contribution in terms of military cooperation was very small in Iraq and Afghanistan. Many analysts believed that Obama was taking India for granted. He even showed no hurry in appointing a new ambassador to India. Having considered all this, some observers were alarmed that the US was 'losing India' and many others warned that such an indifferent attitude and negligent treatment might push India closer to Russia and China.¹³

¹² Interview with Satu Limaye in Washington DC, December 3, 2012.

¹³ David J Karl, 'US-India Relations: The Way Forward', *ORBIS*, Vol. 56, No. 2, Spring 2012, p. 310.

President Obama has been criticised for failing to maintain the momentum of the Indo-US bilateral relations brought on by the Bush Administration through the path-finding nuclear deal. The Administration saw another side of the coin, however and took several steps to improve the relationship. In spite of the initial strains in Indo-US relations, Obama invited Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh to the White House as his first official guest. Secondly, he became the first president since Jimmy Carter to visit India in his first term. Thirdly, during his visit to India in November 2010, he announced US support for an Indian permanent seat on a reformed UN Security Council, which was just as significant as the nuclear cooperation agreement. Finally, although George Bush declared his wish to see Osama Bin Laden dead or alive, and made efforts in that direction, he ultimately failed. President Obama, however, was successful in killing Bin Laden in the Pakistani city of Abbottabad in May 2011. No doubt this success brought a sense of ease to India and mitigated its fear of terror attacks stemming from Pakistan.

Another important point that should be mentioned here is that trade became more important to the US. Indo-US trade has increased hugely since 2000, and, during his visit to Mumbai 2010, President Obama brought 200 business delegations with him – the biggest business delegation ever to any country. That was another substantial difference between the Bush and the Obama Administration. Bush saw India strategically whereas Obama understood the complexity in India's wish not to be a junior partner.¹⁴

Bush always made a point of acknowledging the normalization of relations that begun under the Clinton Administration, and the Obama Administration made a point of continuing the normalization of relations made under the Bush Administration. But the Obama Administration was very critical of the nuclear deal with India. Obama's policy advisers debated among themselves; many of them initially opposed the deal, but eventually they supported it. Both administrations realised that India was a force for good in the world which could be useful for the United States

Although President Bush was unilateralist, he was strategist too in maintaining relation with India. And President Obama though was multilateralist but he still cultivated India. In fact, both cultivated India but looked at it very differently, and both pursued very much same policy in relation to India in practice. Actually, President Obama wanted

¹⁴ Interview with Deepa Ollapally in Washington DC in December 6, 2012.

more from India than President Bush asked for. Whereas Bush wanted to see India as a counterweight to China, Obama wanted to see India not only as a counterweight to China, but to play a supporting role in the broader perspective of international order. Obama regarded India politically a very strong partner in reordering international system. He wanted India to play its greater role on various issues of international politics including climate change and WTO. Finally, President Bush was preoccupied with wars and with Middle East and paid relatively little attention to Asia, although India was to an extent an exception. When Obama came to power, he was determined to redress the balance. Events prevented from doing this to the extent he would have liked but cultivating India as part of the Asian pivot was even more essential to his world view than to Bush's. He was focussed on Asia where India was very much a part of it. Therefore, the US relations with India after 9/11 were not simply ones of continuity but rather an evolution of the relationship, and in that evolution, there were similarities and differences of approaches between the two presidents.

This thesis has shown a number of reasons why Indo-US relations have not been as cordial in the past as they could have been. They have differences of interests but not a conflict of interests. They have shared values and shared interests in many areas. But the main cause of their spiky relations over the years has been the US tendency to treat India as a junior partner, dictating to India what role it should play. The Indian leadership has not been willing any longer to accept outside dictation. When the US tried to impose policy India showed its resentment and was unwilling to play a role dictated primarily by US interests rather than its own. Although the US was always in favour of free trade, Indians saw it not as free trade but US-dominated trade. Despite having shared interest and values, the whole Indian economic and social system was totally different from that of the US and the US insufficiently adjusted their policies to the local situation. India decided to work together with the United States, but they could never become very close, as US attitudes combined with India's tradition, culture, and history did not allow it.

The US wanted a stable South Asia and a strong India to balance Japan, Korea, and China. Neither the US nor India want a powerful China. India wanted to be China's equal, China's friend, and China's partner but not a rival, and certainly not an enemy of China. The United States, however, wanted India to balance China. India still suffers from China-envy and continues to ignore US suggestions that it would serve as a

counterweight to China. The US has not always treated India with due attention, and put India on the backburner for almost 50 years during the Cold War. Too often the US failed to ask what India thought about international order, rather than trying to fit India into an America-led world. The US was not solely responsible for this, however, as the responsibility also lies with India's leadership who also failed to create an image of India as a country with a full potential to be used for the betterment of the world in general, and for the US in particular.

Due to President's Bush's perception of terrorism as the primary threat against the US, he took Pakistan as the US's main ally against terrorism. He wanted to have good relations with India and Pakistan together, which was not realistic. For Obama India became important for its potential and strategic location and commentators like Ikenberry argued in favour of bringing India into international order to buttress American leadership. This was not always easy as the UNSC issue shows. To India, it was not realistic to keep India out of the UNSC, since it has the second largest population in the world and although the United States promised India a permanent membership in UNSC, it cannot make it a reality, because Brazil, Germany, Japan also want the same and favouring just one of these will make enemies of the others.

In short, Indo-US relations underwent significant change after the Cold War, and were transformed even more swiftly in the late 1990s due to the changing world order and increasing Indian potential. Leaders from both countries tended to describe their relationship with a variety of adjectives. In 2004, Prime Minister Vajpayee called as the US and India 'strategic allies'; in 2006, President Bush called them 'natural partners'; in 2005, Prime Minister Singh declared there were 'no limits' to their relations; and finally, President Obama called the Indo-US relationship a defining partnership of the 21st century. Although their relations have not always been so cordial, the increasing closeness represented a major transformation of their past relationship. Now, India has bilateral relations with the US in almost every area. The Indo-US relationship is now much stronger, has survived various ups and downs, and has reached an all-time high. Their shared interests will make it increasingly likely that they become important partners in the years to come.

The purpose of my investigation has been to establish the argument throughout the thesis that Indo-US relations after 9/11 developed positively, despite superficial ups and

downs. This upward trend was not because of the trauma of 9/11. It was because of the changed international political contours, American relative decline, its search for new friends and allies, India's rise, its geo-strategic, its potential and desire to play an active in the international sphere. 9/11 played a role but was not the primary factor because it was America and India's shared values, common interests and rapid Chinese rise that has brought them closer to being leading strategic partners in the 21st century.

Select Bibliography

Primary Sources

Barack Obama, *Address at Cairo University*, June 4, 2009, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/obama/speeches/speech-5502>, accessed 3 December 2015.

Barack Obama, *Address Before a Joint Session of Congress*, February 24, 2009, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/obama/speeches/speech-4612> accessed 30 November 2015.

Barack Obama, *Remarks by President Obama and Prime Minister Singh of India During Arrival Ceremony*, November 24, 2009, available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-obama-and-prime-minister-singh--india-during-arrival-ceremony>

Barack Obama, *Speech delivered at Prague*, April 5, 2009, available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-barack-obama-prague-delivered> accessed 30 November 2015.

Barack Obama, *State of the Union Address*, January 27, 2010, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/obama/speeches/speech-5706>, accessed 6 January 2016.

Barack Obama, *Inaugural Address*, January 20, 2009, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/obama/speeches/speech-4453> , accessed 28 November 2015.

Barack Obama's *Letter to Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh*, September 23, 2008, available at [http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Barack Obama%27s Letter to Prime Minister Manmoha%27n Singh](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Barack_Obama%27s_Letter_to_Prime_Minister_Manmoha%27n_Singh)

Burns, William J., 'India's Rise and the Promise of US-Indian Partnership', *A Speech delivered by the Under Secretary for Political Affairs*, Council on Foreign Relations, Washington, DC, June 1, 2010, available at <http://www.state.gov/p/us/rm/2010/136718.htm>, accessed 3rd January 2016.

Christina Rocca, 'The United States and India: Moving Forward in Global Partnership', *Remarks At a Luncheon Meeting Hosted by the Confederation of Indian Industry*, Oberoi Hotel New Delhi, India September 11, 2003, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/p/sca/rls/rm/23987.htm> , accessed 7 March 2016.

Cohen, Stephen P., Pakistan Aid Cutoff: U.S. Nonproliferation and Foreign Policy Considerations, *Congressional Research Service Reports*, 15 March 2002, <http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/crs/90149.htm>.

Country Report on Terrorism, Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, 30 April, 2007.

Country Reports on Terrorism 2008, United States Department of State Publication Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism Released April 2009.

Cronin, Richard P., South Asia: U.S. Interests and Policy Issues, *Congressional Research Service Reports*, available at <http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/crs/93-243f.htm> 15 Mar. 2002.

Crowley, Philip J., Assistant Secretary, *Daily Press Briefing*, State Department, Washington, DC, September 8, 2010, available at <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2010/09/146914.htm#INDIA>, accessed 16 February 2016.

Dimitrova, Anna, *Obama's Foreign Policy: Between Pragmatic Realism and Smart Diplomacy?*, <http://www.culturaldiplomacy.org/academy/content/pdf/participant-papers/academy/Anna-Dimitrova-Obama's-Foreign-Policy-Between-Pragmatic-Realism-and-Smart-Diplomacy.pdf>, accessed on 21 July 2013.

Discussion between President Kennedy and his aides according to newly declassified recordings released by the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum in Boston.

Document at <http://www.state.gov/pa/prs/ps//2010/06/142645.htm> June 3, 2010.

Dwight D. Eisenhower: 'Letter to Prime Minister Nehru of India Concerning US Military Aid to Pakistan', February 25, 1954. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. Available at <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=10170> accessed on 25 August 2015.

F. Martin, Michael, Shayerah Ilias Akhtar, K. Alan Kronstadt, Samir Kumar, Alison Siskin, 'India-U.S. Economic Relations: In Brief', *Congressional Research Service*, September 26, 2014.

Fact Sheet on Indo-US Cooperation in Public Health, April 2, 2008, available at <http://kolkata.usconsulate.gov/wwwhipr040208a2.html>, accessed on 21 October 2015.

Fact Sheet, US Department of State, Washington, DC, July 18, 2005, available at <http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/article/2005/07/20050718185135cpataruk0.4649774.html#axzz3omhMLdX9>, accessed 15 October 2015.

Fact Sheet, US-India Cooperation in Health, Biomedical Research, Bureau of Oceans, Environment and Science Washington, DC, March 7, 2006, available at

<http://2001-2009.state.gov/p/sca/rls/fs/2006/62716.htm> accessed on 21 October 2015.

Fact Sheet: The United States-India Peaceful Atomic Energy Cooperation Act, Washington, DC December 18, 2006, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/p/sca/rls/2006/77930.htm> accessed on 28 October 2015.

Fact Sheet: The US-India Relationship: A Strategic Partnership, September 26, 2008, available at <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2008/09/20080926-10.html>, accessed October 21, 2015.

Fact Sheet: US-India Partnership on Export Controls and Non-Proliferation, White House, November 8, 2010, available at https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/india-factsheets/India-US_Agreement_on_Export_Controls.pdf, accessed 11 January 2016.

Ford made his statement on September 18, 1975, *Facts on File*, 1975.

George W. Bush, 'Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People', *The White House*, 20 September 2001, available at <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>, accessed 8 March 2016.

George W. Bush, *State of the Union Address*, January 29, 2002, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/gwbush/speeches/speech-4540> accessed 25 September 2015.

George W. Bush, *State of the Union Address*, January 31, 2006, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/gwbush/speeches/speech-4461> accessed on 27 October 2015.

Goldberg, Arthur G., US Representative in the UN Security Council on 18 September 1965, *Department of State Bulletin*, 11 October 1965.

Hilary Clinton, Nomination Hearing To Be Secretary of State, *Statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee*, January 13, 2009, available at <http://www.state.gov/secretary/20092013clinton/rm/2009a/01/115196.htm>, accessed 6 March 2016.

<http://mea.gov.in/Portal/ForeignRelation/United-States-of-America-March-2012.pdf>, accessed on 10 July 2015.

http://www.archive.india.gov.in/knowindia/culture_heritage.php?id=7 accessed on 2 August 2015.

<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2010/09/146914.htm>.

India's Foreign Relations -2013 Documents, XPD Division, Ministry of External Affairs, India.

Indian Ministry of External Affairs, 'Telephone Conversation Between EAM and US Secretary of State', January 23, 2009, White house Statement at http://whitehouse.gov/58_years_of_Indian_democracy; hearing transcript at <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/files/KerryClintonQFRs.pdf>.

India-US 6th High Technology Cooperation Group (HTCG) Meeting New Delhi - February 28-29, 2008, Washington, DC, February 29, 2008, available at https://www.indianembassy.org/archives_details.php?nid=1042 accessed on 21 October 2015.

India-US High Technology Cooperation Group, Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, available at <http://mea.gov.in/in-focus-topic.htm?54/IndiaUS+High+Technology+Cooperation+Group> accessed on 21 October 2015.

India-US Relations: Vision for the 21st Century, www.indiaembassy.org/inews/september-2000.pdf

Joint Statement by President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, *White House Press Release*, Office of the Press Secretary, Washington, DC, July 18, 2005, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/p/sca/rls/pr/2005/49763.htm> accessed on 22 October 2015.

Joint Statement on the Third U.S.-India Strategic Dialogue, *Media Note*, Office of the Spokesperson, Washington, DC June 13, 2012, available at <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2012/06/192267.htm>, accessed 12 January 2016.

Kerr, Paul K., 'U.S. Nuclear Cooperation with India: Issues for Congress', *Congressional Research Service*, June 26, 2012.

Knott, Stephen, 'George H. W. Bush: Foreign Affairs', *Miller Center of Public Affairs*, University of Virginia, Accessed March 10, 2018. <https://millercenter.org/president/bush/foreign-affairs>

Kronstadt, K. Alan & Pinto, Sonia, 'U.S.-India Security Relations: Strategic Issues', *Congressional Research Service*, January 24, 2013.

Kronstadt, K. Alan and Pinto Sonia, 'India-US Security Relations: Current Engagement', *CRS Report for Congress*, November 13, 2012.

Kronstadt, K. Alan, 'India's New Government and Implications for US Interests', *CRS Report for Congress*, August 7, 2014.

Kronstadt, K. Alan, 'India-U.S. Relations', *CRS Report for Congress*, October 2, 2007.

Kronstadt, K. Alan, 'India-US Relations', *CRS Report*, Congressional Research Service, January 30, 2009.

- Kronstadt, K. Alan, 'Pakistan-US Relations', *CRS Issue Brief for Congress*, Congressional Research Service, 28 January, 2005.
- Kronstadt, K. Alan, Kerr, Paul K., Martin, Michael F. and Vaughn, Bruce, 'India-US Relations', *CRS Report for Congress*, Congressional Research Service, October 27, 2010.
- Kronstadt, K. Alan, Kerr, Paul K., Martin, Michael F. and Vaughn, Bruce, 'India: Domestic Issues, Strategic Dynamics, and US Relations', *Congressional Research Service*, September 1, 2011.
- Lugar floor statement on the US-India peaceful atomic energy and US-IAEA additional protocol implementation act of 2006, 15 November 2006, <http://lugar.senate.gov>.
- Manyin, Mark E., et. al, 'Pivot to the Pacific? The Obama Administration's 'Rebalancing' Toward Asia', *CRS Report for Congress*, Congressional Research Service, March 28, 2012.
- Miller Center of Public Affairs, University of Virginia. 'Barack Obama', Accessed November 24, 2015 available at <http://millercenter.org/president/essays-list/obama>.
- New Framework for the US-India Defence Relationship, Embassy of India, Washington DC, 28 June, 2005, <http://www.indianembassy.org/india-us-defense-relations.php>.
- Nicholas R. Burns, 'On the record briefing on the status of the US-India civilian nuclear cooperation initiative and the text of the bilateral agreement for peaceful nuclear cooperation (123 agreement)', US Department of States, 2007, www.state.gov.
- Open Skies Partnerships: Expanding the Benefits of Freer Commercial Aviation, *Fact Sheet*, Bureau of Public Affairs, March 29, 2011.
- Opening Remarks by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the US-India Civil Nuclear Cooperation Agreement, April 05, 2006.
- P., Wolfowitz, The US Deputy Secretary of Defence, 'The Gathering Storm: The Threat of Global Terror and Asia Pacific Security' *The First IISS Asia Security Conference: The Shangri-La Dialogue*, Singapore, May 31-June 2002.
- Pew Global Attitudes Project, 'Global Public Opinion in the Bush Years (2001-2008)', available at <http://www.pewglobal.org/files/pdf/263.pdf> accessed 28 November 2015.
- President Bush *address to the State of the Union to the 107th Congress in January 29, 2002*, available at <http://millercenter.org/president/gwbush/speeches/speech-4540> accessed on 3 October 2015.

President Bush, 'US National Security Strategy: Prevent Our Enemies From Threatening Us, Our Allies, and Our Friends with Weapons of Mass Destruction', New York, June 1, 2002, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ei/wh/15425.htm> , accessed 8 March 2016.

President Bush's *address to a joint session of Congress on Thursday night*, September 20, 2001, available at <http://edition.cnn.com/2001/US/09/20/gen.bush.transcript/> accessed 29 September 2015.

President Discusses Strong U.S.-India Partnership in New Delhi, India, Purana Qila, New Delhi, India, March 3, 2006, available at <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2006/03/20060303-5.html>, accessed February 24, 2018.

President George W Bush speech before embarking on his visit to India in February 2006, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/p/sca/rls/fs/2006/62422.htm>, accessed on 21 May 2014.

President Obama's remarks at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-us-india-strategic-dialogue-reception>.

President, Indian Prime Minister Singh Exchange Toasts, The State Dining Room, Washington, DC July 18, 2005, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/p/sca/rls/rm/2005/49766.htm> accessed on 2 November 2015.

Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, George W. Bush, Book –II, July 1 to December 31, 2006, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 2010.

Remarks by Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism John Brennan at CSIS, May 26, 2010, available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-assistant-president-homeland-security-and-counterterrorism-john-brennan-csi> accessed 1st December 2015..

Remarks by President Barack Obama at Suntory Hall, The White House. Office of the Press Secretary, November 14, 2009, available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-barack-obama-suntory-hall> , accessed 11 March 12, 2016.

Remarks by President Obama and Prime Minister Modi of India After Bilateral Meeting at United Nations Headquarters New York, New York, 28 September 2015, available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/09/28/remarks-president-obama-and-prime-minister-modi-india-after-bilateral> accessed on 10 November 2015.

Remarks by the President and First Lady in Town Hall With Students in Mumbai, India, *White House release*, November 7, 2010.

Remarks by the President to the Joint Session of the Indian Parliament in New Delhi, India, The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, November 08, 2010, available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2010/11/08/remarks-president-joint-session-indian-parliament-new-delhi-india> , accessed 12 March 12, 2016.

Report to Congress on U.S.-India Security Cooperation, US Department of Defense, November 2011.

Secretary Clinton's and Minister Krishna's June 3, 2010 remarks to the media at <http://www.state.gov/secretray/rm/2010/06142642.htm>.

Speech transcript at <http://www.state.gov/p/us/rm/2010/136718.htm>. June 1, 2010.

State Department's February 3, 2010 at <http://fpc.state.gov/136466.htm>.

Statement by Dr. Kakoli Ghosh Dastidar, Member of Parliament, on Situation in Afghanistan at the 65th Session of the United Nations General Assembly on November 04, 2010, available at <https://www.pminewyork.org/adminpart/uploadpdf/90307ind1791.pdf> , accessed 12 March 2016.

Statement by the President on *Next Steps in Strategic Partnership with India*, January 12, 2004, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/p/sca/rls/pr/28109.htm>, accessed 15 October 2015.

Statement of Secretary of State-Designate Collin Powell, Prepared for the Confirmation of the US Senate Committee on Foreign relations, January 17, 2001, available at <http://www.gwu.edu/~action/stopen.html> accessed 2 October 2015.

Stephen P. Cohen, 'More than Just the 123 Agreement: The Future of US-India Relations' *Testimony before House Committee on Foreign Affairs*, June 25, 2008.

Telegram from the Department of State to the Embassy in India, Washington, October 28, 1962, available at <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1961-63v19/d187> accessed on 8 August 2015.

The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States, Norton, New York, 2004.

The First Gore-Bush Presidential Debate, *Commission on Presidential Debate*, October 3, 2000, available at <http://www.debates.org/index.php?page=october-3-2000-transcript> accessed on 28 February 2016.

The First State Dinner: President Obama Welcomes His Excellency Dr. Manmohan Singh of India, *The White House Briefing*, November 24, 2009.

The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, March 2006, The White House, Washington.

The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, May 2010, The White House, Washington.

The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002, The White House, Washington.

The President's Trade Policy Agenda, available at https://ustr.gov/archive/assets/Document_Library/Reports_Publications/2008/2008_Trade_Policy_Agenda/asset_upload_file490_14556.pdf accessed on 27 October 2015.

The United States and Pakistan's Quest for the Bomb, *Newly Declassified Documents Disclose Carter Administration's Unsuccessful Efforts to Roll Back Islamabad's Secret Nuclear Program*, National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book No. 333, The George Washington University, Posted - December 21, 2010, available at <http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb333/>, accessed on 7 March 2016.

Transcript of Remarks by Christina Rocca, Assistant Secretary for South Asian Affairs, *FDCH Political Transcripts*, September 11, 2003.

U.S. Department of State, Foreign Relations of the United States, 1961-1963

United States - India Joint Statement on Next Steps in Strategic Partnership, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2004/36290.htm>, accessed 15 October 2015.

US Department of Defence, 'Report to Congress on US-India Security Cooperation', November 2011, http://www.defence.gov/pubs/pdfs/20111101_NDAA_Report_on_US_India_Security_Cooperation.pdf

US Department of State, *Bulletin*, 23 March 1947

US-India Strategic Dialogue Joint Statement, *Media Note*, Office of the Spokesman, Washington, DC, June 3, 2010, available at <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2010/06/142645.htm>, accessed 12 January 2016.

William J. Burns, Statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 18 September, 2008.

Theses

- Abbasi, Rizwana Karim, A PhD Thesis on *Understanding Pakistan's Nuclear Behaviour (1950s–2010): Assessing the State Motivation and its International Ramifications (a Three Models Approach)*, University of Leicester, 2010.
- Balasundaram, K., PhD Thesis on *The Pursuit of Cooperation: US Policy towards India during the Reagan Administration*, Pondicherry University, India, 2000.
- Becker, Ralph A., Master Thesis on *A Cold War Episode: Détente And U.S. Relations With Pakistan During The 1971 South Asia Crisis*, University Of Northern Colorado, 2012.
- Bhatia, Vandana, PhD Thesis on *Change in the U.S. Nuclear Non-proliferation Policy toward India (1998-2005): Accommodating the Anomaly*, University of Alberta, 2012.
- Coyer, Paul, PhD Thesis on *Congress, China and the Cold War: Domestic Politics and Sino-American Rapprochement and Normalisation, 1969-1980*, London School of Economics and Political Science, 2013.
- Donahue, Tom, *Anger and Reconciliation: Relations between the United States and India, 1953-1956*, Honours Theses. Paper 72, Colby College, 2000.
- Michael Arnold, Australia's Defence Policy: A Market State Approach? PhD Thesis, Deakin University, 2012.
- Slathia, Vikas, Master's Thesis on *United States-India Strategic Partnership: Opportunities and Challenges in the Twenty-first Century*, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 2006.

Interviews

- Telephone Interview with Richard Boucher from Paris on 30 November 2012.
- Interview with Satu Limaye in Washington DC, 3 December 2012.
- Interview with Ambassador Anthony Quainton in Washington DC, 4 December 2012.
- Interview with Thomas Lynch in Washington DC, 5 December 2012.
- Interview with Ambassador Howard B. Schaffer in Washington DC, 5 December 2012.
- Interview with Robert M. Hathaway in Washington DC in December 5, 2012.
- Interview with Professor Thomas Farr in Washington DC, 6 December 2012.
- Interview with Deepa Ollapally in Washington DC, 6 December 2012.
- Interview with Stephen P. Cohen in Washington DC in 7 December 2012.
- Interview with Professor Mike Green in Washington DC, 7 December 2012.

Secondary Sources

Books

- Agnew, John, *Geopolitics: Re-visioning World Politics*, Routledge, 1998.
- Alam, Aftab, *U.S. Military Aid to Pakistan and India's Security*, Raj Publications, Delhi, 2001.
- Alam, Aftab, *US Policy towards South Asia: Special Reference to Indo-Pak Relations*, Raj Publications, Delhi, 1998.
- Ali, Tariq, *The Obama Syndrome: Surrender at Home, War Abroad*, Verso, London, 2010.
- Alter, Jonathan, *The Promise: President Obama, Year One*, Simon & Schuster, London, 2010.
- Anderson, Terry H., *Bush's Wars*, Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Ansari, Ali M., *Confronting Iran: The Failure of American Foreign Policy and the Roots of Mistrust*, Hurst & Company, London, 2006.
- Anstead, Nick and Straw, Will (eds.), *The Change We Need: What Britain Can Learn From Obama's Victory*, Fabian Society, London, 2009.
- Aoki, Andrew L., and Takeda, Okiyoshi, *Asian American Politics*, Polity, UK, 2008.
- Ash, Timothy Garton, *Free World: Why a Crisis of the West Reveals the Opportunity of Our Time*, Penguin, London, 2005.
- Avari, Burjor, *India: The Ancient Past - A History of the Indian sub-continent from c. 7000 BC to AD 1200*, Routledge, 2007.
- Azmi, M. Raziullah, 'Pakistan-United States Relations: An Appraisal' in Ali Meherunnisa (ed.), *Reading in Pakistan's Foreign Policy 1971-1998*, Oxford University Press, Karachi.
- Bacevich, Andrew J., *The New American Militarism: How Americans are Seduced by War*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2005.
- Bajpai, Kanti P. and Stephen P. Cohen (eds.), *South Asia after the Cold War: International Perspectives*, Westview Press, Boulder, 1993.
- Baker, Richard W., Bush Administration Policy in Asia 2001-2004: Second Thoughts and Second Fronts, in *George W. Bush and East Asia: A First Term Assessment*, Ed. by Robert M. Hathaway and Wilson Lee, 2005 Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Asia Programme, Washington, D.C.
- Balz, Dan and Johnson, Haynes, *The Battle for America 2008: the Story of an Extraordinary Election*, Viking, 2009.

- Baxter, Craig et al., *Governments and Politics in South Asia*, Boulder, Westview Press, Colorado, 1991.
- Beasley, Ryan K., et. al., *Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective: Domestic and International Influences on State Behaviour*, Sage, 2013.
- Bennis, Phyllis, *Before & After US Foreign Policy and the September 11th Crisis*, Olive Branch Press, New York, 2003.
- Bergen, Peter, *Manhunt: From 911 to Abbottabad- The Ten- Years Search for Osama Bin Laden*, The Bodley Head, London, 2012.
- Berman, William C., *America's Right Turn: From Nixon to Bush*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Bezbaruah, Ranju, *America and India in Global and South Asian Settings*, Vedams eBooks (P) Ltd., New Delhi, 1999.
- Bhola, P.L. ,*Foreign Policies of India, Pakistan and China*, RBSA Publishers, Jaipur, India, 2001.
- Bhonsle, Rahul (ed.), *Indo-U.S. Civil Nuclear Deal*, Atlantic, New Delhi, 2007.
- Blum, William, *Killing Hope: US Military & CIA Interventions since World War II*, Zed Books, 2003.
- Blum, William, *Rogue State: A Guide to the World's Only Superpower*, Zed Books – London, 2002.
- Blumenthal, Sidney, *The Clinton Wars: An Insider's Account of the White House Years*, Penguin Books, 2003.
- Boggs, Carl, *Imperial Delusions: American Militarism and Endless War*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005.
- Bolton, M. Kent, *US Foreign Policy and International Politics: George W. Bush, 9/11, and the Global-Terrorist Hydra*, Pearson Prentice Hall, 2005.
- Bowles, Chester, *Promises to Keep: My Years in Public Life 1941-1969*, Harper & Row, New York, 1971.
- Branch, Taylor, *The Clinton Tapes: Wrestling History in the White House*, Simon & Schuster, 2009.
- Bras, Pail R., *The New Cambridge History of India: The Politics of India Since Independence*, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Brecher, Michael, *Nehru: A Political Biography*, Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Breuning, Marijke, *Foreign Policy Analysis: A Comparative Introduction*, Palgrave McMillan, 2007.

- Brzezinski, Zbigniew, *The Choice: Global Domination or Global Leadership*, Basic Books, New York, 2004.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew, Scowcroft, Brent, *America and the World: Conversations on the Future of American Foreign Policy*, Basic Books, New York, 2008.
- Buckley, Roger, *The United States in the Asia-Pacific since 1945*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Bucklin, Steven J., *Realism and American Foreign Policy: Wilsonians and the Kennan-Morgenthau Thesis.*: Praeger, Westport, Connecticut, 2001.
- Bumiller, Elisabeth, *Condoleezza Rice: An American Life: A Biography*, Random House, New York, 2007.
- Burg, Steven L., *War or Peace? : Nationalism, Democracy and American Foreign Policy in Post-Communist Europe*, U.P, New York, 1996.
- Burke, S.M. and Ziring, Lawrence, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Historical Analysis* , Oxford University Press, London, 1990.
- Burman, Stephen, *America in the Modern World: The Transcendence of United States Hegemony*, Harvester Wheat sheaf, Hertfordshire, 1991.
- Burman, Stephen, *The State of the American Empire: How the USA Shapes the World*, Earthscan, London, 2007.
- Burnham, Walter Dean (Ed), *The American Prospect: Reader in American Politics*, Chatham House Publishers, 1995.
- Bush, George W., *A Portrait of My Father*, WH Allen, 2014.
- Bush, George W., *Decision Points*, Virgin, London, 2010.
- Buzan, Barry, *The United States and the Great Powers: World Politics in the Twenty-First Century*, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK, 2004.
- Caldwell, Dan, *Vortex of Conflict: US Policy toward Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq*, Stanford University Press, 2011.
- Cameron, Fraser, *US Foreign Policy After the Cold War: Global Hegemon or Reluctant Sheriff?*, Routledge, London, 2005.
- Campbell, Colin and Rockman, Bert A. (eds.), *The Clinton Legacy*, Chatham House Publishers, New York, 2000.
- Campbell, Colin, Rockman, Bert A. and Rudalevige, Andrew (Eds), *The George W. Bush Legacy*, CQ Press, Washington DC, 2008.
- Chandler, Clay and Zainulbhai, Adil, *Reimagining India: Unlocking the Potential of Asia's Next Superpower*, Simon & Schuster, 2013.

- Chandra, Bipan, et. al, *India's Struggle for Independence 1857-1947*, Penguin Books India Pvt Ltd, 1989.
- Chandra, Prakash, *International Relations*, Vikash Publishing House, New Delhi, 1994.
- Chandra, Prakash, *International Relations: Foreign Policies of Major Powers and Regional Systems*, Vikash Publishing House Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi, 1994.
- Chari, Chandra (ed.), *Superpower Rivalry and Conflict: The long shadow of the Cold War on the twenty-first century*, Routledge, 2010.
- Chary, M. Srinivas, *The Eagle and the Peacock: U.S. Foreign Policy Toward India Since Independence*, Greedwood Press, Wesport, United States, 1995.
- Chiozza, Giacomo, *Anti-Americanism and the American World Order*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2009.
- Chitkara, M.G., *Indo-Pak Relations Challenges before New Millennium*, A.P.H., New Delhi, 2001.
- Chodhury, Dilara, *Bangladesh in South Asian International Systems*, Academic Publishers, Dhaka, 1992.
- Chomsky, Noam and Achcar, Gilbert, *Perilous Power: The Middle East and US Foreign Policy, Dialogues on Terror, Democracy, War and Justice*, Penguin, 2007.
- Chomsky, Noam, *Failed States: The Abuse of Power and the Assault on Democracy*, Penguin, 2006.
- Chomsky, Noam, *Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance*, Penguin, London, 2004.
- Chomsky, Noam, *Interventions*, Penguin Books, 2007.
- Chomsky, Noam, *Rogue States: The Rule of Force in World Affairs*, Pluto Press, London, 2000.
- Chomsky, Noam, *Terrorising the Neighbourhood: American Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Era*, AK Press, Scotland, 1991.
- Choppra, Pran, *India's Second Liberation*, Delhi, 1973.
- Chou, David S., *US Policy Toward South Asia in the Post-Cold War Era*, Sheng-Chih Book Co. Ltd, Taipei, 2003.
- Cingranelli, David Louis, *Ethics, American Foreign Policy, and the Third World*, St. Martin's P. New York, 1993.
- Clinton, Hilary, *Hard Choices*, Simon & Schuster, 2014.

- Cohen, Stephen P. and Dasgupta, Sunil, *Arming without Aiming: India's Military Modernization*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, D.C. 2010.
- Cohen, Stephen P., *Beyond America's Grasp: A Century Failed Diplomacy in the Middle East*, Picador, New York, 2009.
- Cohen, Stephen P., *India: Emerging Power*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, DC, 2001.
- Cohen, Stephen P., *The US and South Asia*, Asia Foundation Study, San Francisco, 2006.
- Colas, Alejandro and Saull, Richard (Eds.), *The War on Terrorism and the American 'Empire' after the Cold War*, Routledge, 2006.
- Cole, David, *Enemy Aliens: Double Standards and Constitutional Freedoms in the War on Terrorism*, The New Press, London, 2005.
- Cole, Juan, *Engaging the Muslim World*, Palgrave MacMillan, 2009.
- Coward, Russell H., *A Voice from the Vietnam War*, Greenwood, 2004.
- Cox, Michael and Stokes, Doug (Eds.), *US Foreign Policy*, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Cox, Michael, Lynch, Timothy and Bouchet, Nicolas (eds), *US Foreign Policy and Democracy Promotion: From Theodore Roosevelt to Barack Obama*, Routledge Studies in US Foreign Policy, Routledge, 2013.
- Cox, Michael, *US Foreign Policy after the Cold War: Superpower Without a Mission*, Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, 1995.
- Cox, Ronald W. (Ed), *Corporate Power and Globalization in US Foreign Policy*, Routledge, 2012.
- Crockatt, Richard, *The Fifty Years War: The United States and the Soviet Union in World Politics, 1941–1991*, Routledge, 1995.
- Daalder, Ivo H. and Lindsay, James M., *America Unbound: The Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, 2003.
- Dallek, Robert, *John F. Kennedy: An Unfinished Life 1917-1963*, Penguin, 2003.
- Dallek, Robert, *Nixon and Kissinger: Partners in Power*, Harper Collins Publishers, 2007.
- Davis, Elizabeth Van Wie and Azizian, Rouben, *Islam, Oil, and Geopolitics: Central Asia after September 11*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Plymouth, 2006.
- Davis, John, *Barack Obama and US Foreign Policy: Roadmap for Change or Disaster?*, Author House, Indiana, 2009.

- Deepak, B.R., *India-China Relations: In the First Half of the 20th Century*, A.P.H, Delhi, 2001.
- Deese, David A., *The New Politics of American Foreign Policy*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1994.
- Denoon, David, *Devaluation Under Pressure: India, Indonesia, and Ghana*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986.
- Devare, Sudhir T., et. al, *India's Look East - Act East Policy: A Bridge to the Asian Neighbourhood*, Symbiosis Institute of International Studies (SIIS), Symbiosis International University, Pune, India, 2014.
- Dittmer, Lowell, *South Asia's Nuclear Security Dilemma: India, Pakistan, and China* (ed.), Pentagon Press, New Delhi, 2005.
- Donahue, Katherine C., *Slave of Allah: Zacarias Moussaoui vs. the USA*, Pluto, London, 2007.
- Donaldson, Robert, *Soviet Policy toward India: Ideology and Strategy*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Dormandy, Xenia (Ed.), *The Next Chapter: President Obama's Second-Term Foreign Policy*, Chatham House, London, 2013.
- Dowdle, Andrew J., Van, Dirk C. Raemdonck and Maranto, Robert (eds.), *The Obama Presidency: Change and Continuity*, Routledge, 2011.
- Dumbrell, John and Schäfer, Axel R. (eds.), *America's Special Relationships: Allies and Clients*, Routledge, London, 2009.
- Dumbrell, John, *American Foreign Policy: Carter to Clinton*, McMillan Press, 1997.
- Dumbrell, John, *Clinton's Foreign Policy: Between the Bushes, 1992-2000*, Routledge, 2009.
- Dumbrell, John, *The Making of US Foreign Policy*, Manchester University Press, 1990.
- Ebinger, Charles K. and Mehta, Vikram Singh, 'Time to Act on India-US Energy Cooperation', *India-US Policy Memo*, Brookings, January 2015.
- Ellings, Richard J., Friedberg, Aaron L. and Wills, Michael (Eds), *Strategic Asia 2002-03: Asian Aftershocks*, The National Bureau of Asian Research, Seattle, 2002.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke, *Just War Against Terror: The Burden of American Power in a Violent World*, BasicBooks, New York, 2004.
- Esposito, John L., *Unholy War: Terror in the Name of Islam*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2002.

- Evera, Stephen Van (ed.), *How to Make America Safe: New Policies for National Security*, The Tobin Project, Cambridge, 2006.
- Faludi, Susan, *The Terror Dream: What 9/11 Revealed about America*, Atlantic, London, 2008.
- Filkins, Dexter, *The Forever War: Dispatches From the War on Terror*, Bodley Head, London, 2008.
- Firstbook, Peter, *The Obamas: The Untold Story of an African Family*, Preface Publishing, London, 2010.
- Frankel, Francine R. & Harding, Harry (eds.), *The India-China Relationship: what the United States Needs to Know*, Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Fukuyama, Francis, (Ed.), *Nation Building: Beyond Afghanistan and Iraq*, John Hopkins University Press, 2006.
- Gaddis, John Lewis, *Surprise, Security and the American Experience*, Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Galbraith, John Kenneth, *Ambassador's Journal*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1969.
- Galiullin, Rustem, *The CIA in Asia: Covert Operations Against India and Afghanistan*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1988.
- Ganguly, Shivaji, *U.S. Policy toward South Asia*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 1990.
- Ganguly, Sumit (Ed), *India's Foreign Policy: Retrospect and Prospect*, Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Ganguly, Sumit & Hagerty, Devin T., *Fearful Symmetry: India-Pakistan Crises in the Shadow of Nuclear Weapons*, Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Ganguly, Sumit, *India as an Emerging Power*, Frank Cass Publishers, UK, 2003.
- Ganguly, Sumit, *Indian Foreign Policy*, Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Ganguly, Sumit, Shoup, Brian and Scobell, Andrew (eds.), *US-Indian Strategic Cooperation into the 21st Century: More than Words*, Routledge, 2006.
- Gardner, Hall, *American Global Strategy and the 'War on Terrorism'*, Ashgate, 2005.
- Gardner, Lloyd C. and Young, Marilyn B. (Eds), *The New American Empire: A 21st Century Tech-in On US Foreign Policy*, The New Press, 2005.
- Gehring, Verna V., Md, Lanham, *War after September 11*, Rowman& Littlefield, 2003.
- Gerges, Fawaz A., *Obama and the Middle East: The End of America's Moment?* Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

- Gökay, Bülent, Walker, R.B.J. (Ed.), *11 September 2001: War, Terror and Judgement*, Frank Cass, London, 2003.
- Gould, Harold A., *The South Asia Story: The First Sixty Years of US Relations with India and Pakistan*, Sage Publications, 2011.
- Guānxì, Zhōng- Yìn Wàijiāo, 'India-China Relations', *Berkshire Encyclopedia of China*, Berkshire Publishing Group LLC, 2009.
- Guelke, Adrian, *The New Age of Terrorism and the International Political System*, I. B. Tauris, London, 2009.
- Gupta, Bhabani Sen (ed.), *Regional Cooperation and Development in South Asia*, South Asian Publishers, Delhi, 1986.
- Gupta, Kulwant Rai, *Indo-US Civil Nuclear Deal*, Volume 2, Atlantic Publishers & Dist, India, 2007.
- Gurtov, Mel, *Superpower on Crusade: The Bush Doctrine in US Foreign Policy*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2006.
- Haass, Richard N., *Foreign Policy Begins at Home: The Case for Putting America's House in Order*, Basic Books, New York, 2014.
- Haass, Richard N., *War of Necessity, War of Choice: A Memoir of Two Iraq Wars*, Simon & Schuster, 2009.
- Hagerty, Devine T. (ed.), *South Asia in World Politics*, Oxford, Pakistan, 2006.
- Hanahoe, Tom, *America Rules: US Foreign Policy, Globalisation and Corporate USA*, Brandon, Ireland, 2003.
- Hanson, Victor Davis, *How the Obama Administration Threatens to Undermine Our National Security*, Encounter Books, New York, 2009.
- Haseler, Stephen, *The Varieties of Anti-Americanism: Reflex and Response*, Ethics and Public Policy Centre, Washington DC, 1985.
- Hastedt, Glenn P., *American Foreign Policy*, Pearson, 2011.
- Hastedt, Glenn P., *American Foreign Policy: Past, Present, Future*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2000.
- Hauerwas, Stanley & Lentricchia, Frank, (ed.), *Dissent from the Homeland: Essays After September 11*, Duke University Press, 2003.
- Held, David and Koenig-Archibugi, Mathias (Eds), *American Power in the Twenty-First Century*, Polity, UK, 2004.
- Heller, Dana (ed.), *The Selling of 9/11: How a National Tragedy Became a Commodity*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

- Henshall, Ian, and Morgan, Rowland, *9/11 Revealed: Challenging the Facts Behind the War on Terror*, Robinson, London, 2005.
- Herring, George C., *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy*,
- Hewitt, Steve, *The British War on Terror: Terrorism and Counterterrorism on the Home Front Since 9-11*, Continuum, London, 2007.
- Hilali, A. Z, *US-Pakistan Relationship*, Ashgate, England, 2005.
- Hixson, Walter, *The Myth of American Diplomacy: National Identity and US Foreign Policy*, Yale University Press, 2008.
- Hodge, Carl C. and Nolan, Cathal J. (Eds), *US Presidents and Foreign Policy: From 1789 to the Present*, ABC –CLIO, 2007.
- Hodges, Adam, Nilep, Chad (ed.), *Discourse, War and Terrorism*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 2007.
- Holmes, Kim R., and Moore, Thomas g. (eds.), *Restoring American Leadership: A US Foreign and Defence Policy Blueprint*, The Heritage Foundation, 1996.
- Honderich, Ted, *After the Terror*, Edinburgh University Press, 2003.
- Hook, Steven W. and Scott, James M. (Eds), *US Foreign Policy Today: American Renewal?*, CQ Press, 2012.
- Ikenberry, G. John (Ed), *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays*, Longman, 2002.
- Ikenberry, G. John (ed.), *America Unrivaled: The Future of the Balance of Power*, Cornell University Press, 2002.
- Ikenberry, G. John, *Liberal Order & Imperial Ambition*, Polity Press, UK, 2006.
- Inbar, Efraim and Rynhold, Jonathan (Eds), *US Foreign Policy and Global Standing in the 21st Century: Realities and Perceptions*, Routledge, 2016.
- Indyk, Martin S., Lieberthal, Kenneth G., and O’Hanlon, Michael E., *Bending History: Barack Obama’s Foreign Policy*, Brookings Institution Press, 2012.
- Inoguchi, Takashi and Ikenberry, G. John (Eds.), *The Troubled Triangle: Economic and Security Concerns for the United States, Japan, and China*, Palgrave McMillan, 2013.
- Isaacs, Harold R., *Scratches on Our Minds: American Views of China and India*, Routledge 2015.
- Jackson, Robert J. and Towle, Philip, *Temptations of Power: The United States in Global Politics after 9/11*, Palgrave McMillan, 2006.

- Jacobson, Gary C., *A Divider, Not A Uniter: George W. Bush and the American People*, Pearson Longman, 2008.
- Jain, Rashmi, *the United States and India, 1947-2006: A Documentary Study*, (ed.), Radiant Pub, New Delhi, 2007.
- James Mann, *Rise of the Vulcans: The History of Bush's War Cabinet*, Viking.
- Jayapalan, N., *Foreign Policy of India*, Atlantic, Delhi, 2004, 2001.
- Jentleson, Bruce W., *American Foreign Policy: The Dynamics of Choice in the 21st Century*, W.W. Norton, 2007.
- Jervis, Robert, *American Foreign Policy in a New Era*, Routledge, 2005.
- Jha, Nalini Kant, *South Asia in Twenty-First Century: India, Her Neighbours, and the Great Powers* (ed.), South Asian Pub, New Delhi, 2003.
- John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy During the Cold War*, Oxford, 2005.
- John Newhouse, *Imperial America: The Bush Assault on the World Order*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2003.
- Johnson, Haynes, *Sleepwalking Through History: America in the Reagan Years*, W.W. Norton, 2003.
- Johnston, Douglas (ed.), *Foreign Policy into the 21st Century: The US Leadership Challenge*, Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Washington DC, 1996.
- Jolivet, Andrew J. (ed.), *Obama and the Biracial Factor: The Battle for a New American Majority*, The Policy Press, University of Bristol, 2012.
- Kapur, Ashok et.al, *India and the United States in a Changing World*, (ed.), Sage, New Delhi, 2002.
- Kapur, Ashok, *India – From Regional to World Power*, Routledge, 2006.
- Katz, Mark N., *Leaving Without Losing: The War on Terror After Iraq and Afghanistan*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012.
- Kaufman, Joyce P., *A Concise History of US Foreign Policy*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2010.
- Kellner, Douglas, *From 9/11 to Terror War: the Dangers of the Bush Legacy*, Rowman& Littlefield, Lanham, Maryland, 2009.
- Khan, Rais Ahmed, (ed.), *Forty Years of Pakistan-United States Relations*, Royal Book Company, Karachi, 1990.

- Khanna, Malika, 'Pakistan's Intransigence in Indo-US Relations' in Vinoy Kumar Malhotra (ed.), *Indo-US Relations in Nineties*, Anmol Publications, New Delhi, 1995.
- Kheli, Shirin R. Tahir, *India, Pakistan and the United States*, Karachi Vanguard, 1998.
- Kissinger, Henry Alfred, *American Foreign Policy*, Norton, New York, 1977.
- Kissinger, Henry, *Diplomacy*, Simon & Schuster, 1994.
- Kissinger, Henry, *Does America Need a Foreign Policy? Toward a Diplomacy for the 21st Century*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 2001.
- Kissinger, Henry, *The White House Years*, Little Brown, Boston, 1979.
- Kissinger, Henry, *World Order: Reflections on the Character of Nations and the Course of History*, Allen Lane, Penguin, 2014.
- Kissinger, Henry, *Years of Renewal*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1999.
- Kloppenber, James T., *Reading Obama: Dreams, Hope, and the American Political Tradition*, Princeton University Press, United States, 2011.
- Kodikara, Shelton U. (ed.), *External Compulsion of South Asian Politics*, Sage, New Delhi, 1993.
- Kolko, Gabriel, *World in Crisis: the End of the American Century*, Pluto Press, London, 2009.
- Kreps, Sarah E., *Coalitions of Convenience: United States Military Interventions After the Cold War*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2011.
- Kupchan, Charles A., *The End of the American Era: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Geopolitics of the Twenty-first Century*, Vintage Books, New York, 2002.
- Kux, Dennis, *India and the United States: Estranged Democracies 1941-1991*, National Defense University Press, Washington, 1992.
- Kux, Dennis, *The United States and Pakistan 1947-2000: Disenchanted Allies*, The John Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- Laidi, Zaki, *Limited Achievements: Obama's Foreign Policy*, Palgrave MacMillan, New York, 2012.
- Latham, Michael E., *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and US Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present*, Cornell University Press, 2011.
- Leffler, Melvyn P. and Legro, Jeffrey, W.(ed.), *To Lead the World: American Strategy after the Bush Doctrine*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008.

- Leslie, Kim G. (ed.), *Roots of America: An Anthology of Documents Relating to American History in the West Sussex Record Office*, Chichester, Published by West Sussex County Council, 1976.
- Levering, Ralph B., *The Cold War: A Post Cold War History*, Harlan Davidson, Illinois, 2005.
- Lewis, Adrian R., *The American Culture of War: The History of US Military Force from World War II to Operation Iraqi Freedom*, Routledge, 2007.
- Liska, George, *Imperial America: The International Politics of Primacy*, Studies in International Affairs Number 2, The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1967.
- Litwak, Robert S., *Détente and the Nixon Doctrine: American Foreign Policy and the Pursuit of Stability, 1969-1976*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1984.
- Lodha, Sanjay et.al. , *Indo-US Relations and Critical Socio-Political Issues*, Deep Pub. New Delhi, 2006.
- Lynch, Timothy J. and Singh, Robert S., *After Bush: The Case for Continuity in American Foreign Policy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.
- Mabee, Bryan, *Understanding American Power: The Changing World of US Foreign Policy*, Palgrave Macmillan, UK, 2013.
- MacDonald, David B., Nabers Dirk and Patman Robert G. (eds.), *The Bush Leadership, the Power of Ideas, and the War on Terror*, Ashgate, 2012.
- Malik, Hafeez, *US Relations with Afghanistan and Pakistan: The Imperial Dimension*, Oxford University Press, Karachi, 2008.
- Malik, Iftikhar, *Pakistan: Democracy, Terror and the Building of a Nation*, New Holland Publishers, 2010.
- Malik, Y.K & D.K. Vajpeyi (Eds.), *India: The Years of Indira Gandhi*, E.J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands, 1988.
- Malone, David M. and Khong, Yuen Foong (Eds.), *Unilateralism & US Foreign Policy: International Perspectives*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, London, 2003.
- Mamdani, Mahmood, *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: America, the Cold War, And the Roots of Terror*, Pantheon Books, New York, 2004.
- Margulies, Phillip, *Nuclear Non-proliferation*, Facts On File Inc, New York, 2008.
- Mark, Joshua J., *India, Ancient History Encyclopaedia*, available at <http://www.ancient.eu/india/> accessed on 6 August 2015.
- Mathew, Thomas (Ed.), *In Search of Congruence Perspectives on India-US Relations under the Obama Administration*, IDSA, New Delhi, 2010.

- Matthews, Christopher, *Kennedy & Nixon: The Rivalry that Shaped Post-war America*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1997.
- Maxwell, Neville, *India's China War*, Natraj Publisher, Dehra Dun, 1970.
- May, Ernest R., *The 9/11 Commission Report with Related Documents*, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2007.
- McClellan, Scott, *What Happened: Inside the Bush White House and Washington's Culture of Deception*, Public Affairs, New York, 2008.
- McCormick, James M., *American Foreign Policy and Process*, Wadsworth, 2005.
- McCracken, Trevor B., *American Exceptionalism and the Legacy of Vietnam: US Foreign Policy since 1974*, Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.
- McEvoy, Siobhán, *American Exceptionalism and US Foreign Policy: Public Diplomacy at the End of the Cold War*, Palgrave, New York, 2001.
- McKay, David, *American Politics & Society*, Blackwell Publishing, 2005.
- McKeever, Robert J. and Davies, Philip, *A Brief Introduction to US Politics*, Pearson Longman, 2006.
- McMahon, Robert, *The Cold War on the Periphery: The United States, India and Pakistan*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1994.
- Mearsheimer, John J. and Walt, Stephen M., *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York, 2008.
- Mendell, David, *Obama: From Promise to Power*, Enfield, New York, 2008.
- Meredith, Robyn, *The Elephant and the Dragon: The Rise of India and China and What it Means for all of Us*, Norton, 2008.
- Merrill and Paterson, (eds.), *Major Problems in American Foreign Relations, Volume II: Since 1914*, Houghton Mifflin, 2005.
- Merrill, Daniel C., *America Decline: Causes and Solutions*, Xlibris, USA, 2014.
- Metcalf, Barbara D. & Metcalf, Thomas R., *A Concise History of Modern India*, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Meyerowitz, Joanne, (ed.), *History and September 11th*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, Pa., 2003.
- Minkenberg, Michael and Ditigen, Herbert (Eds), *The American Impasse: US Domestic and Foreign Policy after the Cold War*, University of Pittsburgh Press, United States, 1996.
- Misra, Amalendu, *Afghanistan: The Labyrinth of Violence*, Malden, Cambridge, 2004.

- Mitra, Subrata K. & Rill, Bernd (eds.), *India's New Dynamics in Foreign Policy*, Hanns Seidel Foundation, Munich, 2006.
- Mockaitis, Thomas R., *Iraq and the Challenge of the Counterinsurgency*, Praeger Security International, 2008.
- Mohan, C. Raja, 'The US Role in South Asia', *America's Role in Asia: Asian and America Views, Recommendations for US Policy from Both Sides of the Pacific*, The Asian Foundation, San Francisco, 2008.
- Morgenthau, Hans J., *Politics Among Nations; The Struggle for Power and Peace*. A.A. Knopf, New York, 1948.
- Moynihan, Daniel Patrick, *A Dangerous Place*, Little, Brown and Company, 1978.
- Moynihan, Daniel Patrick, *Secrecy*, Yale University Press, 1998.
- Muni, S.D. & Chadha, Vivek (Eds), *Asian Strategic Review 2014: US Pivot and Asian Security*, IDSA, New Delhi, 2014.
- Myers, Robert J., *U.S. Foreign Policy in the 21st Century: The Relevance of Realism*, LA: Louisiana University Press, Baton Rouge, 1999.
- Naiman, Arthur, *9/11 the Simple Facts: Why The Official Story Can't Possibly Be True*, Soft Skull Press, USA, 2011.
- Nanda, B.R (ed.), *Introduction to Indian Foreign Policy: The Nehru Years*, Vikash Publication, New Delhi, 1976.
- Nayar, Baldev Raj & Paul, T.V., *India in the World Order: Searching for Major-Power Status*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Neack, Laura, *The New Foreign Policy: Power Seeking in a Globalized Era*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2008.
- Nehru, Jawaharlal, *The Discovery of India*, Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Newhouse, John, *Imperial America: The Bush Assault on the World Order*, Knopf, New York, 2003.
- Nixon, Richard, *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*, Warner Books, New York, 1978.
- Nojumi, Neamatollah, *The Rise of the Taliban in Afghanistan: Mass Mobilization, Civil War, and the Future of the Region*, Basingstoke, Palgrave, New York, 2002.
- Nye, Joseph S. Jr, *Is the American Century Over?*, Polity Press, UK, 2015.
- Nye, Joseph S. Jr, *The Paradox of American Power: Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go It Alone*, Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Nye, Joseph S. Jr., *The Powers to Lead*, Oxford University Press, 2008.

- O'Sullivan, Christopher D., *Colin Powell: A Political Biography*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Maryland, United States, 2009.
- Obama, Barack, *Change We Can Believe In: Barack Obama's Plan to Renew America's Promise*, Three Rivers Press, New York, 2008.
- Obama, Barack, *Dreams From My Father*, Canogate Books Ltd., UK, 2008.
- Obama, Barack, *The Audacity of Hope: Thoughts on Reclaiming the American Dream*, Canogate Books Ltd., Edinburgh, UK, 2008.
- Olsen, Edward A., *US National Defense for the Twenty-first Century : The Grand Exit Strategy*, Frank Cass, London, 2002.
- O'Sullivan, Christopher D., *Colin Powell: American Power and Intervention from Vietnam to Iraq*, Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2009.
- Painter, D. S., *Encyclopedia of US Foreign Policy*,
- Palmer and Perkins, *International Relations*, AITB, New Delhi, 1997.
- Pant, Harsh V., *Contemporary Debates in Indian Foreign and Security Policy: India Negotiates its Rise in the International System*, Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.
- Pant, Harsh V., *The US-India Nuclear Pact: Policy, Process and Great Power Politics*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2011.
- Parmar, Inderjeet and Cox, Michael, (eds.), *Soft Power and US foreign Policy: Theoretical, Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, Routledge, London, 2010.
- Parmar, Inderjeet, Miller, Linda B. and Ledwidge, Mark, (eds.), *New Directions in US Foreign Policy*, Routledge, London, 2009.
- Paul, T.V., *The India-Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Rivalry*, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Peleg, Ilan, *The Legacy of George W. Bush's Foreign Policy: Moving Beyond Neo-conservatism*, Westview Press, Colorado, United States, 2009.
- Perl, Raphael, (2003), *Terrorism, the Future and US Foreign Policy*, Congressional Research Service, the Library of Congress, 2003.
- Phillips, Kevin, *American Theocracy: The Peril and Politics of Radical Religion, Oil and Borrowed Money in the 21st Century*, Penguin Books, New York, 2007.
- Pillar, Paul R., *Terrorism and US Foreign Policy*, Brookings Institution Press, 2003.
- Price, Susannah F., *To What Extent Do the Actions of the Bush Administration Represent a Shift in the Pattern of US Foreign Policy Since 1945?* Sussex M.A. Thesis, 2003.

- Prouty, L. Fletcher, *The Secret Team: The CIA and Its Allies in Control of the United States and the World*, US Air Force, 1997.
- Quester, George H., *American Foreign Policy: The Lost Consensus*, Praeger, 1982.
- Rabasa, Angel M., Benard, Cheryl, Chalk, Peter et.al., *The Muslim World after 9/11*, RAND, 2004.
- Rasanayagam, Angelo, *Afghanistan: A Modern History Monarchy, Despotism or Democracy? The Problems of Governance in the Muslim Tradition*, I. B. Tauris, London, 2002.
- Rasgotra, Maharajakrishna (Ed), *The New Asian Power Dynamic*, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 2007.
- Renshon, Stanley A., *National Security in the Obama Administration: Reassessing the Bush Doctrine*, Routledge, London, 2009.
- Reus-Smit, Christian, *American Power and World Power*, Polity Press Ltd., Cambridge, 2004.
- Rice, Condoleezza, *No Higher Honour: A Memoir of My Years in Washington*, Simon & Schuster, London, 2011.
- Riddell, Peter, *Hug them Close: Blair, Clinton, Bush and the 'Special Relationship'*, Politico's, London, 2004.
- Ripley, Randall B. and Lindsay, James M. (Eds.), *US Foreign Policy after the Cold War*, University of Pittsburgh Press, United States, 1997.
- Risen, James, *State of War: The Secret History of the CIA and the Bush Administration*, Pocket, London, 2007.
- Robert J. McMahon, *The Cold War on the Periphery: The United States, India and Pakistan*, Columbia University Press, 1996.
- Roberts, Brad (ed.), *US Foreign Policy after the Cold War*, MIT Press, Massachusetts, 1992.
- Rogak, Lisa (Compiled), *Barack Obama in His Own Words*, JR Books, UK, 2009.
- Roper, Jon, *The American Presidents: Heroic Leadership from Kennedy to Clinton*, Edinburgh University Press, 2000.
- Rosati, Jerel A., *The Politics of United States Foreign Policy*, Harcourt Brace College Publishers, United States, 1993.
- Rowe, Cami, *The Politics of Protest and US Foreign Policy: Performative Construction of the War on Terror*, Routledge, 2013.

- Rudolph, Lloyd I. and Rudolph, Susanne Hoeber (Eds.), *Making US Foreign Policy toward South Asia: Regional Imperatives and the Imperial Presidency*, Indiana University Press, 2008.
- Ruthven, Malise, *A Fury for God: The Islamist Attack on America*, Granta, London, 2002.
- Ryan, David, *Frustrated Empire: US Foreign Policy, 9/11 to Iraq*, Pluto Press, London, 2007.
- Ryan, David, *US Foreign Policy in World History*, Routledge, London, 2000.
- Sanger, David E., *The Inheritance: The World Obama Confronts and the Challenges to American Power*, Bantam, London, 2009.
- Sattar, Abdul, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: 1947-2009 A Concise History*, Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Schaffer, Teresita C., *India and the United States in the 21st Century: Reinventing Partnership*, CSIS, 2009.
- Scott, James M. (Ed), *After the End: Making US Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War World*, Duke University Press, 1998.
- Scott, James M., *After the End: Making U.S. foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War World*, *Peace Research Abstracts* 38, No. 2, 2001.
- Seidler, Victor Jeleniewski, *Remembering 9/11: Terror, Trauma and Social Theory*, Palgrave MacMillan, 2013.
- Sestanovich, Stephen, *Maximalist: America in the World from Truman to Obama*, Vintage Books, New York, 2014.
- Shalom, Stephen Roskamm, *Imperial Alibis: Rationalising US Intervention after the Cold War*, South End Press, Boston, 1993.
- Sharma, S.R., *Foundations of Indian Foreign Policy*, Omsons, New Delhi, 2002.
- Sharma, Sita Ram, (ed.) *U.S. Nuclear Agreement for Cooperation with India*, Alfa Pub, New Delhi, 2007.
- Sharma, Urmila and Sharma, S.K, *International Relations: Theory and History*, Atlantic Publishing and Distributors, New Delhi, 2001.
- Sharpe, Mike, *America in Decline*, Armonk, New York, 2012.
- Sherman, Daniel J. and Nardin, Terry (eds), *Terror, Culture, Politics: 9/11 Reconsidered*, Indiana University Press, 2006.
- Sieff, Martin, *Shifting Superpowers: The New and Emerging Relationship between the United States, China, and India*, CATO Institute, Washington DC, 2009.

- Singh, Naunihal, *The United States and Pakistan: The Estranged Bedfellows*, Authorspress, Delhi, 2006.
- Singh, Poonam, *Indo-American Relations*, Vista International, Delhi, 2006.
- Singh, Robert, *American Government and Politics: A Concise Introduction*, Sage Publications, 2003.
- Siobhán McEvoy-Levy, *American Exceptionalism and US Foreign Policy: Public Diplomacy at the End of the Cold War*, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Sondhi, M.L. and Kapur, Ashok, *US and India: Changing Strategic Parameters*, Manak, Delhi, 2002.
- Sörensen, Jens Stilhoff, (ed.), *Challenging the Aid Paradigm: Western Currents and Asian Alternatives*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Soros, George, *The Bubble of American Supremacy: The Cost of Bush's War in Iraq*, Public Affairs, 2004.
- Stern, Robert W., *Changing India: Bourgeois Revolution on the Subcontinent*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Sugrue, Thomas J., *Not Even Past: Barack Obama and the Burden of Race*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2010.
- Talbott, Strobe, *Engaging India: Diplomacy, Democracy and the Bomb*, Penguin Group, Brooking Institution Press, 2004.
- Talbott, Strobe, Madan, Tanvi , Mehta, Vikram Singh and Sidhu, W.P.S., *The Modi-Obama Summit: A Leadership Moment for India and the United States*, Brookings India Initiative, September 2014.
- Talbott, Strobe, Madan, Tanvi , Mehta, Vikram Singh and Sidhu, W.P.S., *The Second Modi-Obama Summit: Building the India-US Partnership*, Brookings India Initiative, January 2015.
- Thomas J. McCormick ,*America's Half-Century: United States Foreign Policy in the Cold War and After*, Johns Hopkins, 1995.
- Tiwari, S.C., *Indo-US Relations*, Radiant, New Delhi, 1977.
- Todd, Chuck &Gawiser Sheldon, *How Barack Obama Won: A State by State Guide to the Historic 2008 Presidential Election*, Vintage Books, New York, 2009.
- Tripathy, Amulya K., *Post 9/11 United States-India Relations: Toward An Active Engagement*, Reference Press, New Delhi, 2013.
- Unger, Craig, *House of Bush, House of Saud: The Secret Relationship between the World's Two Most Powerful Dynasties*, Gibson Square, London, 2006.

- Valone, Stephen J., *Two Centuries of US Foreign Policy: The Documentary Record*. Praeger Press, Westport, CT, 1995.
- Van Meter Crabb, Cecil, *Policy-Makers and Critics: Conflicting Theories of American Foreign Policy*, Praeger, New York, 1986.
- Vats, Bhagat, *Foreign Intrigue Against India*, Aman Publishers, New Delhi, 1967.
- Vorys, Karl Von, *American Foreign Policy: Consensus at Home, Leadership Abroad*, Praeger, Westport, Connecticut, 1997.
- Walker, Clarence E. and Smithers, Gregory D., *The Preacher and the Politician: Jeremy Wright, Barack Obama, and Race in America*, University of Virginia Press, 2009.
- Walker, William, *Weapons of Mass Destruction and International Order*, Adelphi Paper 370, Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, *The Decline of American Power*, The New Press, New York, 2003.
- Watson, Robert P. et. al. (Eds.), *The Obama Presidency: A Preliminary Assessment*, Suny Press, The State University of New York, 2012.
- Watts, Duncan, *Understanding American Government and Politics*, Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Wekesser, Carol, *American Foreign Policy: Opposing View Points*, Greenhaven Press Inc, San Diego, United States, 1993.
- White, Donald Wallace, *The American Century: The Rise and Decline of the United States as a World Power*, Yale University Press, 1999.
- Willis, Deborah and Merida, Kevin, *Obama: The Historic Campaign in Photographs*, Amistad, An Imprint of Harper Collins Publishers
- Winkler, Carol K., *In the Name of Terrorism: Presidents on Political Violence in the Post-World War II Era*, State University of New York Press, 2006.
- Winters, L. Alan and Yusuf, Shahid (Eds), *Dancing with Giants: China, India and the Global Economy*, The World Bank, Washington DC, 2007.
- Wirda, Howard J., *Cracks in the Consensus: Debating the Democracy Agenda in US Foreign Policy*, Praeger, Westport, 1997.
- Wittkopf, Eugene R. and Christopher M. Jones, *The Future of American Foreign Policy*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1999.
- Wittkopf, Eugene R., Kegley, Charles W., Scott, Jr., James M. Belmont, *American Foreign Policy: Pattern and Process*, Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2003.

Wood, Michael, *The Story of India*, BBC Books.

Woodward, Bob, *Bush at War*, Pocket, London, 2003.

Woodward, Bob, *Obama's Wars*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 2010.

Woodward, Bob, *Plan of Attack*, Simon & Schuster, 2004.

Woodward, Bob, *State of Denial*, Simon & Schuster, London, 2006.

Woodward, Bob, *The War Within: A Secret White House History, 2006-2008*, Simon & Schuster, London, 2008.

Zakaria, Fareed, *The Post-American World And the Rise of the Rest*, Penguin Books, 2009.

Zelizer, Julian E., (ed.), *The Presidency of George W. Bush: A First Historical Assessment*, Princeton University Press, 2010.

Zizek, Slavoj, *Welcome To The Desert of the Real! Five Essays on September 11 and Related Dates*, Verso, London, 2002.

Zunes, Stephen, *Tinderbox: US Middle East Policy and the Roots of Terrorism*, Zed Books, 2003.

Journal Articles

Acharya, Amitav, 'The Bush Doctrine and Asian Regional Order: The Perils and Pitfalls of Pre-emption', *Asian Perspective*, Vol. 27, No. 4, 2003.

Agrawal, Subhash, 'India and the United States: A New Partnership', *The International Spectator*, Vol. 46, No. 2, 2011.

Ahmed, Ishtiaq, 'The 1947 Partition of India: A Paradigm for Pathological Politics in India and Pakistan', *Asian Ethnicity*, Vol. 3, No. 1, March 2002.

Ahmed, Samina, 'Nuclear Proliferation in South Asia: U.S. Policy Challenges', *Foreign Policy* 6, No. 28, July 2001.

Akbar, Muqarrab, 'Pakistan's Foreign Policy: Internal Challenges in New Millennium', *Berkley Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Feb 2011.

Alam, Mohammed Badrul, 'Analysing Indo-US Relations during Bush Presidency', *Area Studies: A Journal of International Studies and Analysis*, Vol.3, No.1, 2009.

Albright, Madeleine K., 'Realism and Idealism in American Foreign Policy Today', *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* 5, No. 56: 434. June 1994.

- Ali, Muntazir, 'Strategy for Peace: Af-Pak and Beyond', *Pakistan Horizon*, Vol. 63, No. 1, January 2010.
- Allin, Dana H. & Jones, Erik, 'Chapter Two: Barack Obama and the limits of superpower', *Adelphi Series*, Vol. 52, Nos 430-431, 2012.
- Amin, Tahir, 'Kargil Crisis in Kashmir', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 2000.
- Amstutz, Mark R., 'The Bush Doctrine: A Niebuhrian Assessment', *The Review of Faith & International Affairs*, Vol. 5, No. 4, 2007.
- Andersen, Walter & Verma, Shrey, 'Washington's India Pivot: Is it Compatible with Modi's Asian Ambitions?' *India Quarterly*, Vol. 71, No. 2, 2015.
- Anderson, Walter K., 'Reviving the Momentum in US Engagement with India: An American Perspective', *India Quarterly*, Vol. 66, No. 1, 2010.
- Anghie, Antony and Hill, Charles, 'The Bush Administration Preemption Doctrine and the United Nations', *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting* (American Society of International Law), Vol. 98, March-April, 2004.
- Bacevich, A. J. and Prodromou, E. H., 'God Is Not Neutral: Religion and U.S. Foreign Policy after 9/11', *Orbis*, Vol. 48 No.1, Winter, 2004.
- Badie, Dina, 'Groupthink, Iraq, and the War on Terror: Explaining US Policy Shift toward Iraq', *Foreign Policy Analysis* 6, International Studies Association, 2010.
- Bajoria, Jayshree and Pan, Esther, 'The U.S.-India Nuclear Deal', *Council on Foreign Relations*, November 5, 2010.
- Bajpai, Kanti, 'U.S. and Us', *India International Centre Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 3/4, India 60 (winter 2006-Spring), 2007.
- Baldauf, India Rises as Strategic US Ally, *Christian Science Monitor*, January 26, 2004.
- Banerjee, Jyotirmoy, 'Obama's Af-Pak Dilemma', *Indian Journal of Asian Affairs*, Vol. 23, No. 1/2 (June-December), 2010.
- Barnds, William J., 'India and America at Odds', *International Affairs*, Vol. 49, No. 3, July, 1973.
- Bhaskar, C. Uday, 'The Strategic Context of India-US Defence Relations' *ORF Seminar Series*, Vol. 1, No. 7, Aril 2012.
- Bhatia, Vandana, 'The US-India Nuclear Agreement: Revisiting the Debate', *Strategic Analysis* Vol. 36, No. 4, July-August 2012.
- Bhonsle, Rahul, 'Prospects of Indo-US Defence Partnership: A Prognosis', *Scholar Warrior*, Autumn, 2012.
- Bill Richardson, 'New Realism: A Realistic and Principled Foreign Policy', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 87, No. 1 (Jan. - Feb.), 2008.

- Bokhari, Sarahh, 'Indo-Pak New Peace', *ISYP Journal on Science and World Affairs*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 2005.
- Boucher, Richard A., 'Pursuing Peace, Freedom, and Prosperity in South and Central Asia', *The DISAM Journal*, 2006.
- Bouton, Marshall M., 'America's Interests in India', *US-India Initiative Series*, Centre for a New American Security, October 2010.
- Brooks, Stephen G. and Wohlforth, William C., 'International Relations Theory and the Case against Unilateralism', *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 3, No. 3.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew and Mearsheimer, John J., 'Clash of the Titans', Special Report, *Foreign Policy*, October 22, 2009.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew, 'From Hope to Audacity: Appraising Obama's Foreign Policy', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 89, No. 1 (January/February), 2010.
- Bukhari, Syed Shahid Hussain, 'India-United States Strategic Partnership: Implications for Pakistan', *Berkeley Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan 2011.
- Burns, R. Nicholas, 'America's Strategic Opportunity with India: The New US-India Partnership', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 86, No. 6, November/December 2007.
- Buzan, Barry and Cox, Michael, 'China and the US: Comparable Cases of 'Peaceful Rise'?', *The Chinese Journal of International Politics*, Vol. 6, 2013.
- Campbell, Kurt, New Directions in U.S. Policy toward Asia: The Initial Bush Approach, *American Foreign Policy Interests* 23, No. 4, 209-214, 2001.
- Carter, Ashton B., America's New Strategic Partner?, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 85, No. 4, July/Aug., 2006.
- Chacko, Priya, 'A New "Special Relationship"?: Power Transitions, Ontological Security, and India-US Relations', *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 15, 2014.
- Chatterjee, Ananya, 'India-China-United States: The Post-Cold War Evolution of a Strategic Triangle', *Political Perspectives*, Vol. 5, No. 3, 2011.
- Chaudhuri, Rudra, 'Balancing US Interests in India and Pakistan', *The International Spectator: Italian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 46, No. 2, 2011.
- Chiriyankandath, James, 'Realigning India: India Foreign Policy after the Cold War', *The Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 93, No. 374, April 2004.
- Cohen, Stephen P., 'Right for the Right Reasons? The Reagan Administration in India', *India International Centre Quarterly*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 1988.
- Cohen, Stephen P., India Rising, The Brookings Institution, June 1, 2000, available at <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/india-rising/>, accessed on 15 May 2018.

- Cox, Michael, 'September 11th and U.S. Hegemony—Or Will the 21st Century Be American Too?' *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 3, 2002.
- Cox, Michael, 'Still the American Empire', *Political Studies Review*, Vol. 5, 2007.
- Cox, Michael, 'Is the United States in Decline—Again? An Essay', *International Affairs*, Vol.83, No. 4, 2007.
- Cox, Michael, 'Power Shifts, Economic Change and the Decline of the West?', *International Relations*, Vol. 26, No. 4, 2012.
- Curtis, Lisa, 'Going the Extra Mile for a Strategic US-India Relationship', *Backgrounders*, The Heritage Foundation, Washington, No. 2719, August 20, 2012.
- Das, Runa, 'The United States–India Nuclear Relations after 9/11: Alternative Discourses', *Asian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 2012.
- Dasgupta, Sunil & Cohen, Stephen P., 'Is India Ending its Strategic Restraint Doctrine?', *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 2, 2011.
- Devereux, David R., 'The Sino-Indian War of 1962 in Anglo-American Relations', *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 44, No. 1, January 2009.
- Devine, Jack and Kassel, Whitney, 'Afghanistan: Withdrawal Lessons', *World Policy Journal*, Fall 2013.
- Dittmer, Lowell, 'Recent American Asia Policy: A Critical Review', *ASIEN* 100, July 2006.
- Dobbins, James & Shinn, James, 'Afghanistan: Guidelines for a Peace Process', *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy*, Vol. 53, No.4, 2011.
- Ejaz, Ahmad, 'United States - India Relations: An Expanding Strategic Partnership', *Pakistan Vision*, Vol. 13 No. 1.
- Fani, Muhammad Ishaque, 'The Indo-US Strategic Partnership in the Post 9/11: Implications for Pakistan', *Pakistan Vision*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 2009.
- Feigenbaum, Evan, 'India's Rise, America's Interest: The Fate of the U.S.-Indian Partnership', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 89, No. 2, March/April 2010.
- Feigenbaum, Evan, 'Obama's India Problem', *Council on Foreign Relations Expert Brief*, April 9, 2010.
- Finan, Bill, 'Nuclear Diplomacy Up Close: Strobe Talbott on the Clinton Administration and India', *India Review*, Vol. 4, No. 1.
- Foley, Duncan K., 'The Economic-Historical Roots of US Foreign Policy', The talk was prepared for the New York University Series *Critical Issues in Global Affairs*, November 18, 2007.
- Gaddis, J. L., 'Grand Strategy in the Second Term', *Foreign Affairs*, (Jan/Feb), 2005.

- Ganguly, Sumit and Pardesi, Manjeet S., 'Explaining Sixty Years of India's Foreign Policy', *India Review*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 2009.
- Ganguly, Sumit, 'Deterrence Failure Revisited: The Indo-Pakistan War of 1965', *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 4, December 1990.
- Ganguly, Sumit, 'India's Foreign Policy Grows Up', *World Policy Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 4, December 2003.
- Ganguly, Sumit, 'The Start of a Beautiful Friendship? The United States and India', *World Policy Journal*, Vol. XX, No. 1, Spring 2003.
- Geelani, Gawhar, 'Kashmir: the Forgotten Conflict', *Race & Class*, Vol. 56, No. 2, 2014.
- George J. Gilboy and Eric Heginbotham, 'Double Trouble: A Realist View of Chinese and Indian Power', *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 36, No. 3, 2013, p. 139
- Gerges, Fawaz A., 'The Obama Approach to the Middle East: the End of America's Moment?', *International Affairs* Vol. 89, No. 2, 2013.
- Gideon, Rose, 'Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy', *World Politics* Vol. 51, No. 1, 1998.
- Gojree, Mehraj Uddin, 'The U.S. Interests and Policies towards South Asia: From Cold War Era to Strategic Rebalancing', *Research Journal of Language, Literature and Humanities*, Vol. 2, No. 4, April 2015.
- Gopalaswamy, Bharath, 'Indo-U.S. Space Cooperation: Aiming Higher', *Issue Perspective*, Vol. 1, Issue 2, CSIS, August 11, 2011.
- Gowan, Richard, 'The Obama Administration and Multilateralism: Europe Relegated', *FRIDE Policy Brief*, No. 39, February 2010.
- Guihong, Zhang, 'US Security Policy towards South Asia after September 11 and its implications for China: A Chinese Perspective', *Strategic Analysis*, Vol. 27, No. 2 April-June, 2003.
- Gul, Mehran, 'US National Security Strategy: Managing Strategic Partnerships in South Asia', *Yale Journal of International Affairs*, Winter, 2009.
- Hagerty, Devin, 'US Policy and the Kashmir Dispute: Prospects for Resolution', *India Review*, Vol. No. 3, 2003.
- Hathaway, Robert M., 'India and the US Pivot to Asia', *Yale Global Online*, 24 February 2012.
- Hayes, Jarrod, 'Securitization, Social Identity, and Democratic Security: Nixon, India, and the Ties That Bind', *International Organization*, Vol. 66, Issues 1, 2012.
- Hilali, A. Z., 'Cold War Politics of Superpowers in South Asia' *The Dialogue: A Quarterly Research Journal*, Pakistan Vol.1, No. 2, April-June 2006.

- Hirsh, M., 'Bush and the World. The Need for a New Wilsonianism', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 5, (Sep/Oct), 2002.
- Hirsh, Michael, 'Bush and the World', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 5 (September-October), 2002.
- Hirsh, Michael, Bush and the World, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 5 September-October, 2002.
- Hosur, Prashant, 'The Indo-US Civilian Nuclear Agreement: What's the Big Deal?', *International Journal*, Spring 2010.
- Ikenberry, G. John, 'The Future of the Liberal World Order: Internationalism After America', *Foreign Affairs*, May/June Issue, 2011.
- Ikenberry, G. John, 'American hegemony and East Asian order', *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 58, No. 3, September 2004.
- Ikenberry, G. John, 'Is American Multilateralism in Decline?', *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 1, No. 3, September 2003.
- Ikenberry, G. John, 'Power and Liberal Order: America's Postwar World Order in Transition', *International Relations of the Asia Pacific*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 2005.
- Inderfurth, Amb. Karl F. and Latif, S. Amer, 'US.-India Military Engagement: Steady as She Goes', *US-India Insight*, CSIS, Vol. 2, Issue 10, October 2012.
- Indurthy, Rathnam, 'The Turns and Shifts in the U.S. Role in the Kashmir Conflict since 1947: Today's Propitious Times for a Facilitator to Resolve It', *Asian Affairs*, Vol. 32, No. 1, Spring, 2005.
- Indyk, Martin S., Lieberthal, Kenneth G., and O' Hanlon, Michael E., 'Scoring Obama's Foreign Policy: A Progressive Pragmatist Tries to bend History', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 91, No. 3, 2012.
- Jabeen, Musarrat, Either You Are with Us or Against Us, *South Asian Studies*, Vol. 24, No.2, July-December 2009.
- Jabeen, Mussaratand Ahmed, Ishtiaq, 'Indo-US Nuclear Cooperation', *South Asian Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 2, July-December 2011.
- Jaishankar, Dhruva, 'US-India Relations: From Vision to Process', *Asia Pacific Bulletin*, No. 83, East-West Centre, Honolulu, November 18, 2010.
- James M. Lindsay, 'George W. Bush, Barack Obama and the Future of US Global Leadership', *International Affairs*, Vol. 87, Issue. 4, 2011.
- Javaid, Umbreen & Fatima, Qamar, 'US Foreign Policy Parameters towards Pakistan and India (2001-2008)', *Journal of Political Studies*, Vol. 19, Issue -2, 2012.
- Javaid, Umbreen, 'Intensive US Engagement for Enhanced Role in South Asia', *South Asian Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 1, January-June 2010.

- Ji, YOU, 'Obama's Asian Policy: Change and Continuity', *EAI Background Brief No. 425*, 21 January 2009.
- Joshi, Yogesh, 'Reluctant India, Rising China and Alliance Politics in the Asia-Pacific', *East-West Centre Asia Pacific Bulletin*, No. 162, April 26, 2012.
- Kagan, Robert, 'End of Dreams, Return of History', *Policy Review*, 144, (August-September), 2007.
- Kagan, Robert, 'The Benevolent Empire', *Foreign Policy*, No. 111, Summer, 1998.
- Kagan, Robert, 'The September 12 Paradigm: America, the World, and George W. Bush', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 87, Issue. 5, (Sep/Oct), 2008.
- Kagan, Robert, 'The September 12 Paradigm: America, the World, and George W Bush', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 87, No. 5, 2008.
- Kapur, S. Paul and Ganguly, Sumit, 'The Transformation of US-India Relations: An Explanation for the Rapprochement and Prospects for the Future', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 47, Issue 4, July-August 2007.
- Kapur, S. Paul, 'India and Pakistan's Unstable Peace: Why Nuclear South Asia is not Like Cold War Europe'?, *International Security*, Volume 30, Number 2, Fall 2005.
- Kapur, S. Paul, 'Ten Years of Instability in a Nuclear South Asia', *International Security*, Volume 33, Number 2, Fall 2008.
- Karl, David J, 'US-India Relations: The Way Forward', *ORBIS*, Vol. 56, No. 2, Spring 2012.
- Karl, David J., 'The Desi Factor in U.S.-India Relations', *Foreign Policy Association*, March 28, 2013.
- Khan, M.A. Muqtader, Nice But Tough: A Framework for US Foreign Policy in the Muslim World, Vol. IX, Issue 1, Summer, 2002.
- Khan, Selina Adam, 'The Realist/Constructivist Paradigm: US Foreign Policy towards Pakistan and India', *Reflections*, No. 8, 2010.
- Khory, Kavita R., 'Assessing "Af-Pak" Strategy: Regional Perspectives on the Obama Administration's Foreign Policy in South Asia', *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, Routledge, 37, 2010.
- Knopf, Jeffery W., 'Wrestling with Deterrence: Bush Administration Strategy after 9/11', *Contemporary Security Policy*, Vol. 29, No. 2, August 2008.
- Kugiel, Patryk, 'United States-India: Partnership of Democracies for the 21st Century', *PISM Research Papers*, Issue: 14, May 2010.
- Kumar, A. Vinod, 'A Doctrine at Work: Obama's Evolving Nuclear Policy and What it Bodes for India', *Strategic Analysis*, Vol. 35, No. 2, March 2011.

- Kumar, Dheeraj, 'Indo-US Relations: Historical Perspectives', *Strategic Insights*, Vol. VIII, Issue 3 August 2009, Centre for Contemporary Conflict
- Kumar, Radha, South Asia, *Foreign Policy Online- Council on Foreign Relations*, 20 January 2002, <http://www.foreignpolicy2000.org/library/issuebreifs/IBSouthAsia.html>
- Kumar, Satish, 'The Evolution of India's Policy towards Bangladesh in 1971', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 15, No. 6, 1975.
- Kux, Dennis, 'A Remarkable Turnaround: US-India Relations', *Foreign Service Journal*, October 2002.
- Kux, Dennis, 'India's Fine Balance', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 3, May-June 2002.
- Lafeber, Walter, 'The Bush Doctrine', *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 26, No. 4, Fall 2002.
- Laud, Rajnath P., 'The Perception Gap: US-Indian Relations and the Chinese Invasion of 1962', *A Journal of Undergraduate History*.
- Lavoy, Peter R., 'Pakistan's Kashmir Policy after the Bush Visit to South Asia', *Strategic Insights*, Vol. V, Issue 4, April, 2006.
- Layne, Christopher, 'China's Challenge to US Hegemony', *Current History*, January 2008.
- Layne, Christopher, 'Offshore Balancing Revisited', *The Washington Quarterly*, Spring, 2002.
- Leffler, Melvyn P., '9/11 and American Foreign Policy', *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 29, No. 3, 2005.
- Leffler, Melvyn P., '9/11 and the Past and Future of American Foreign Policy', *International Affairs*, Vol. 79, No. 5, 2003.
- Leffler, Melvyn P., '9/11 Retrospect: George W. Bush's Grand Strategy, Reconsidered', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 90, No. 5, (September/October), 2011.
- Lele, Ajey and Mishra, Archana, 'Indo-US Strategic Partnership: Beyond the Nuclear Deal', *Asia Specific Journal of Social Sciences*, Special Issue No. 1, Dec 2010.
- Li, Zhang, 'China-India Relations: Strategic Engagement and Challenges', *Asie Visions* 34, IFRI, Centre for Asian Studies, France, September, 2010.
- Li, Zhang, Sino-Indian Strategic Dialogue: An Exploration of Institutionalized Interaction and Constraints, *South Asian Studies Quarterly*, No. 3.
- Lieber, Robert J., 'America in Decline? It's a Matter of Choices, Not Fate' *World Affairs* Vol. 175, No. 3, 2012.
- Limaye, Satu P., 'Mediating Kashmir: A Bridge Too Far', *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 26, no. 1, Winter 2002-03.

- Lowrie, Arthur L. 'The Campaign Against Islam and American Foreign Policy', *Middle East Policy* 4, No. 1-2, September 1995.
- Malika, Ramianu, 'India-US Relations in the Shadow of an Uncertain Nuclear Deal', *Asian Journal on Terrorism and Internal Conflicts*, Vol. 11, No. 41, October 2008.
- Malone, David M. and Mukherjee, Rohan, 'India-US Relations: The Shock of the New', *International Journal*, Vol. 64, No. 4, Canada and Asia, 2009.
- Martinez, J. Michael, 'The Carter Administration and the Evolution of American Nuclear Nonproliferation Policy, 1977–1981', *The Journal Of Policy History*, Vol. 14, No. 3, 2002.
- Mastanduno, Michael, 'After Bush: A Return to Multilateralism in U. S. Foreign Policy?' *Nanzan Review of American Studies*, Vol. 30, 2008.
- Mastanduno, Michael, 'Hegemonic Order, September 11, and the Consequences of the Bush Revolution', *International Relations of the Asia Pacific*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 2005.
- Mastanduno, Michael, 'US Foreign Policy and the Pragmatic Use of International Institutions', *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 59, No. 3, September 2005.
- McCartney, P. T. 'American Nationalism and US foreign Policy from September 11 to the Iraq War', *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 119, No. 3, Fall, 2004.
- McCracken, Trevor, 'Ten Years on: Obama's War on Terrorism in Rhetoric and Practice', *International Affairs*, Vol. 87, Issue. 4, 2011.
- McMahon, 'Robert J., US Policy toward South Asia and Tibet during the Early Cold War', *Journal of Cold War Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 3, Summer 2006.
- Mistry, Dinshaw, 'A Theoretical and Empirical Assessment of India as an Emerging World Power', *India Review*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2004.
- Mistry, Dinshaw, 'US Arms Sales to India', *Asia Pacific Bulletin*, No. 271, 8 July 2014, East-West Center, Washington.
- Mizan, Zia and Ramana, M.V., 'Wrong Ends, Means, and Needs: Behind the US Nuclear Deal with India', *Arms Control Today*, Vol. 36, January/February 2006.
- Mizan, Zia, 'The United States and India', *Economic and Political Weekly*, October 13, 2007.
- Mohan, C. Raja, India and the Balance of Power, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 85, No. 4, July-August., 2006.
- Mohan, C. Raja, 'India's Geopolitics and Southeast Asian Security', *Southeast Asian Affairs*, Volume 2008.

- Mohan, C. Raja, 'India-US Relations: Modi and Obama Begin a New Chapter', *ISAS Brief*, No. 360, 29 January 2015, Institute of South Asian Studies, NUS, Singapore.
- Mohan, C. Raja, 'What If Pakistan Fails? India Isn't Worried... Yet', *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 1, Winter 2004-05.
- Morey, Daniel S., Thyne, Clayton L., Hayden, Sarah L. & Sinters, Michael B., 'Leader, Follower, or Spectator? The Role of President Obama in the Arab Spring Uprising', *Social Science Quarterly*, Volume 93, Number 5, December 2012.
- Mudiam, Prithvi Ram, 'The India-Pakistan Dispute over Jammu and Kashmir and the United States', *Global Change, Peace & Security*, Vol. 15, No. 3, October 2003.
- Müller, Harald and Schmidt, Andreas, 'Natural Friends'? Relations between the United States and India after 2001, *Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF) Reports*, No. 87, 2009.
- Munir, Muhammad & Ahsan, Muhammad, 'US Strategic Policy towards India and Pakistan in Post 9/11', *The Turkish Yearbook*, Vol. XXXIX, 2008.
- Narlikar, Amrita, 'All that Glitters is not Gold: India's Rise to Power', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No.5, 2007.
- Narlikar, Amrita, 'India Rising: Responsible to Whom?', *International Affairs*, Vol. 89, No. 3, 2013.
- Narlikar, Amrita, 'Is India a Responsible Great Power?', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 9, 2011.
- Nasir, Syma, American Foreign Policy Objectives in South Asia, *Defense Journal Current Affairs*, 20 January 2002, <http://www.defensejournal.com/globe/apr99/american-foreign.htm>.
- Nautiyal, Annupurna, 'Current Trends in India-US Relations: Hopes for a Secure Future', *Strategic Insights*, Centre for Contemporary Conflict, Vol. V, Issue 4, April, 2006.
- Nielsen, Kristian L., 'Continued drift, but without the acrimony: US-European relations under Barack Obama', *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, Vol.11, No. 1, 2013.
- Obama, Barack, 'Renewing American Leadership', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 86, No. 4, July/August 2007.
- Owens, Mackubin Thomas, 'The Bush Doctrine: The Foreign Policy of Republican Empire', *ORBIS*, Winter 2009.
- Paal, Douglas, 'The United States and Asia in 2011: Obama Determined to Bring America Back to Asia', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 52, No.1, January/February 2012.

- Pant & Gopalaswamy, Bharath, 'India's Emerging Profile in Space', *The RUSI Journal*, Vol. 153 No. 5, October 2008.
- Pant, Harsh V. and Joshi, Yogesh, 'The American "Pivot" And The Indian Navy: It's Hedging All the Way', *Naval War College Review*, Winter 2015, Vol. 68, No. 1.
- Pant, Harsh V., 'India in Afghanistan: A Trajectory in Motion', *Jadavpur Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 17, No. 1, 2013.
- Pant, Harsh V., 'Modi's Unexpected Boost to India-U.S. Relations', *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 37, No. 3, 2014.
- Pant, Harsh V., Joshi, Yogesh, 'Indian Foreign Policy Responds to the U.S. Pivot', *Asia Policy*, Number 19, January 2015.
- Pardesi, Manjeet S., 'American Global Primacy and the Rise of India', *Asia Pacific Issue*, Analysis from the East-West Center No. 129, March 2017.
- Passmore, R., 'Famine in India: An Historical Survey', *The Wider World*, August 18, 1951.
- Patricia, L. Dunmire, '9/11 Changed Everything': An Intertextual Analysis of the Bush Doctrine', *Discourse & Society*, Vol. 20, No. 2.
- Pranger, Robert J., 'American Foreign Policy after Iraq', *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 3, Summer 2008.
- Prins, Brandon C. and Wilford, Allan, 'US Leadership in Post 9/11 World: Comparing World Views and Foreign Policy Decisions of George W. Bush and Barack Obama', *Policy Brief*, 1:14, Fall 2013, The Howard H. Baker Centre for Public Policy.
- Quinn, Adam, 'The Art of Declining Politely: Obama's Prudent Presidency and the Waning of American Power', *International Affairs*, Vol. 87, Issue, 4, July 2011.
- Rahawestri, Mayang A., 'Obama's Foreign Policy in Asia: More Continuity than Change', *Security Challenges*, Vol. 6, No. 1, Autumn 2010.
- Reddy, Y. Obi, 'The US Aid to India: A Study in Foreign Aid Diplomacy 1957-64', *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 58, No. 1, 1997.
- Reese, Stephen D. and Lewis, Seth C., 'Framing the War on Terror: The Internalization of Policy in the US Press', *Journalism*, Vol. 10, No. 6, 2009.
- Rehman, Fatehur, 'Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Ideological Appraisal', *The Dialogue*, Vol. 1, No. 4,
- Riemer, Andrea K., US foreign policy from Bush to Bush: Enduring parameters and policy options Part 3: The Bush43 presidencies – Policy options, *AARMS Security*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 2008.

- Rishi, Girish, 'Remembering three of India's Oldest Friends', *Rediff India Abroad*, May 30, 2007.
- Rocca, Christina, 'United States Policy towards South Asia'. *The DISAM Journal*, Fall, 2005.
- Roy, Bhaskar, 'President Obama's Asia Swing: Not Very Harmonious for South Asia', Paper No. 3516, *South Asia Analysis Group*, Noida, India, November 2009.
- Rubin, Eric S., 'America, Britain, and *Swaraj*: Anglo-American Relations and Indian Independence, 1939–1945', *India Review*, Vol. 10, No. 1, January–March, 2011.
- Rubinoff, Arthur G., 'Changing Perceptions of India in the US Congress', *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, Vol. 28, No.1, 2001.
- Rudolph, Loyd and Rudolph, Susanne Hoeber, The Making of US Foreign Policy for South Asia: Offshore Balancing in Historical Perspective, *Economic and Political Weekly*, February 25, 2005.
- Sagar, Rahul, 'What's in a Name? India and America in the Twenty-First Century', *Survival*, Vol. 46, No. 3, Autumn 2004.
- Schaffer, Teresita C., 'US Influence on Pakistan: Can Partners Have Divergent Priorities?', *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 1, Winter 2002-03.
- Shankar, Uma, 'Obama's Af-Pak Strategy and Implications for South Asia', *Himalayan and Central Asian Studies*, Vol. 15 No. 1-2, Jan.-June 2011.
- Sharma, Ashok, 'The U.S.-India Strategic Partnership: An Overview of Defense and Nuclear Courtship', *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, July 4, 2013.
- Shuja, Sharif, 'The United States and India', *International Journal on World Peace*, Vol. 23, No.2 June 2006.
- Sierlecki, Bonnie J., 'Gerald Ford: Remarks On Signing A Proclamation Granting Pardon To Richard Nixon, September 8, 1974' (8 September 1974), *Voices of Democracy*, Vol.5, 2010.
- Singh, Dinesh, 'Indo-US Relations', *Strategic Analysis*, Vol. 33, No. 6 November 2009.
- Singh, S. Nihal, 'Can the U.S. and India Be Real Friends?', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 23, No. 9 Sep., 1983.
- Smith, Paul J., 'The Geopolitics of Climate Change: Power Transitions, Conflict and the Future of Military Activities', *Conflict, Security & Development*, Vol.11, No.3, 2011.
- Soherwordi, Syed Hussain Shaheed, 'US Foreign Policy Shifts toward Pakistan between 1965 & 1971 Pak-India Wars', *South Asian Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 1, January-June 2010.
- Soherwordi, Syed Hussain Shaheed, 'Pakistan's Foreign Policy Interaction with US Foreign Policy Making Bodies (1947-2010): An Analysis', *IPRI Journal*, Vol. X, No. 2, Summer 2010.

- Srivastava, Siddhartha, 'US-India Relations Strained Under Obama', *World Politics Review*, June 16, 2009.
- Starr, Joel E., 'Can the US and India Be 'Steadfast Friends'?', *Orbis*, Foreign Policy Institute, Elsevier science Limited, 2001.
- Staten, Cliff, 'US Foreign Policy Since World War II: An Essay on Reality's Corrective Qualities', *American Diplomacy*, July 30, 2005.
- Stent, Angela, 'US-Russia Relations in the Second Obama Administration', *Survival*, Vol. 54, No.6, 2012.
- Sutter, Robert, 'The Obama Administration and US Policy in Asia', *Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs*, Vol. 31, No. 2, August 2009.
- Tadman, Kyle, 'An American Provocation: U.S. Foreign Policy during the Soviet-Afghanistan War', *Western Illinois Historical Review*, Vol. V, Spring 2013.
- Tay, Simon S.C., 'Asia and the United States after 9/11: Primacy and Partnership in the Pacific', *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*, Vol. 28, No. 1, Winter, 2004.
- Tellis, Ashley J., 'India as a Leading Power', *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, Washington DC, April 2016.
- Tellis, Ashley J., 'Obama in India, Building a Global Partnership: Challenges, Risks, Opportunities', *Policy Outlook*, Carnegie Endowment For International Peace, Washington, October, 2010.
- Tellis, Ashley J., 'The Evolution of U.S.-Indian Ties: Missile Defense in an Emerging Strategic Relationship', *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 4, Spring, 2006.
- Tellis, Ashley J., 'The Merits of De-hyphenation: Explaining US Success in Engaging India and Pakistan', *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 31, No. 4, Autumn 2008.
- Tellis, Ashley J., 'The Transforming U.S.-Indian Relationship and Its Significance for American Interests', *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, Washington, D.C. 2007.
- Thacker-Kumar, Leena and Campbell, Joel R., 'U.S. Foreign Policy In Asia Since 9/11: Temporary Alliances Or Permanent Changes?', *International Social Science Review*, Vol. 82, Nos. 3 & 4.
- Thornton, Thomas P., 'The United States and South Asia', *Survival*, Vol. 35, No. 2 Summer 1993.
- Tung, Hakan, 'Pre-emption in the Bush Doctrine: A Reappraisal', *Foreign Policy Analysis* 5, International Studies Association, 2009.
- Twing, Daniel, America's Grand Design in Asia, *The Washington Quarterly*, Summer, 2007.

- Twining, Daniel, 'America's Grand Design in Asia', *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 30, No. 3, Summer, 2007.
- Umbreen Jaben, 'The Changing trends of Security: Influence on South Asia', *J.R.S.P.* , Vol. 45, No. 1, 2008.
- Wallenstein, Immanuel, 'The Decline of U.S. Power', *Contexts*, Spring 2005.
- Wallenstein, Immanuel, 'The Eagle Has Crash Landed', *Foreign Policy*, No. 131 (Jul. – Aug), 2002.
- Walt, Stephen M. 'The Renaissance of Security Studies', *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 2, June 1, 1991.
- Walt, Stephen, Beyond Bin Laden: Reshaping U.S. Foreign Policy, *International Security* 26, No. 3 56-78, 2001.
- Warner, Geoffrey, 'Nixon, Kissinger and the Breakup of Pakistan, 1971', *International Affairs*, Vol. 81, No.5, 2005.
- Weinstein, Kenneth R., *Perspective for the New Administration: Global Challenges for the Obama Administration*, Hudson Institute, Washington.
- Weiss, Leonard, 'India and the NPT', *Strategic Analysis*, Vol. 34, No. 2, 2010.
- Weiss, Leonard, 'U.S.-India Nuclear Cooperation', *The Nonproliferation Review*, Vol. 14, No. 3.
- Wilder, Dennis, 'The US-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue: Continuity and Change in Obama's China Policy', *China Brief*, Vol. IX, No. 10, May 2009.
- X, 'The Sources of Soviet Conduct', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 25 No.4, July 1947.
- Ziring, Lawrence, 'Pakistan and India: Politics, Personalities and Foreign Policy', *Asian Survey*, Vol. VIII, No. 7, July 1978.

Articles in Newspapers

- 'Preserve Rule of Law': Obama's Inauguration Letter to Trump Revealed, *the Guardian*, 4 September 2017.
- Bahadrakumar, M.K., 'India frets over Obama's Chinamania', *Asia Times* 14 March 2009, available at http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South_Asia/KC14Df01.html, Accessed 11 January 2016.
- Burns, Nicholas, 'Heady Times' for India and the US, *Washington Post*, April 29, 2007.
- Carpenter, Ted Galen, 'Fading Hopes for India As a Strategic Counterweight to China', *China-US Focus*, 4 October 2013.

- Carroll, Lisa O', Tony Blair Knew immediately that 9/11 Terror Attacks 'Changed Everything', *The Guardian*, 10 September 2011.
- Cohen, Roger, 'What the World Wants from America', *The New York Times*, 11 January 2005.
- Curtis, Lisa, 'China's Rise and India's Obvious Partner (the US)', *The Daily Signal*, March 05, 2012, available at <http://dailysignal.com/2012/03/05/concerns-about-china-should-strengthen-indo-u-s-ties/>, accessed March 12, 2016.
- D'Souza, Dinesh, 'In praise of American empire', *The Christian Science Monitor*, April 26, 2002, available at <http://www.csmonitor.com/2002/0426/p11s01-coop.html>, accessed 21 February 2016.
- Goldenberg, Suzanne, 'The Guardian Profile: Paul Wolfowitz', *The Guardian*, 1 April, 2005.
- Guha, Ramachandra, 'Galbraith and India - Certainly the most imposing of all US Ambassadors to India', *The Telegraph*, Calcutta, May 27, 2006.
- Hiatt, Fred, 'Stay-the-Course Plus', *The Washington Post*, June 4, 2007, available at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/03/AR2007060300951.html>, accessed 10 March 2016.
- Hoagland, Jim, 'Whose Asian Century?', *The Washington Post*, June 9, 2005.
- In Search of Open Skies: Easing Restrictions on Foreign Airlines Can Only Rejuvenate the Aviation Sector, *The Indian Express*, March 1, 2014.
- India Faces Food Shortages, *The Canberra Times*, 1 July 1949, National Library of Australia, available at <https://trove.nla.gov.au/newspaper/article/2811575>, accessed on 15 February 2018.
- India, US sign 'open skies' agreement, *The Hindu*, April 15, 2005.
- Indo-US Joint Statement, *The Hindu*, July 31, 2005.
- Joshi, Manoj, 'India - A counterweight to the rise of China', *Mid -Day*, 16 September 2014, available at <http://www.mid-day.com/articles/india---a-counterweight-to-the-rise-of-china/15606168> accessed on 29 June 2015.
- Kapila, Subhash, 'New Framework For The U.S-India Defence Relationship', *Intelli Briefs*, July 6, 2005.
- Khare, Harish, 'A Friend of India', *The Hindu*, New Delhi, May 1, 2006.
- Krishnaswami, Sridhar, 'India, U.S Sign Framework for Defence Cooperation', *The Hindu*, June 30, 2005.
- Kumar, Arun, India's 1974 Nuclear Test Hurt Ties: US, *Hindustan Times*, December 22, 2007.

- Malhotra, Inder, 'Helping the US help us', *The Indian Express*, January 08, 2010, available at <http://archive.indianexpress.com/news/helping-the-us-help-us/564843/>, accessed 7 March 2016.
- Military pacts on hold but India, US continue with exercises, arms deals', *The Times of India*, September 22, 2010, available at <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/India/Military-pacts-on-hold-but-India-US-continue-with-exercises-arms-deals/articleshow/6601777.cms> accessed on 24 October, 2015.
- Mohan, Raja, 'Indo-U.S. relations: Who's afraid of America', *India Today*, December 27, 2012.
- Mohan, Raja, 'Washington Embrace is Warmer and Closer', *Financial Times*, 25 January 2008, London.
- Narendra Modi-Barack Obama hotline becomes operational, *The Indian Express*, 15 August 2015, available at <http://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-others/narendra-modi-barack-obama-hotline-becomes-operational/> accessed on 10 November 2015.
- Nayar, Kuldeep, 'India-US Treaty or Alliance'? *The Dawn*, Lahore, July 16, 2005.
- O'Neill, Jim, 'China could overtake US economy by 2027', *The Telegraph*, November 19, 2011, available at <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/economics/8901828/Jim-ONeill-China-could-overtake-US-economy-by-2027.html>, accessed 25 February 2016.
- Pant, Harsh V., 'India's New-Found Irrelevance', *Outlook*, March 24, 2009 and Pant, 'The Thrill is Gone', *Outlook*, July 22, 2009.
- Parthasarathy, Malini, India's place in the new U.S. world view, *The Hindu* (January 30, 2001), available at <http://www.thehindu.com/thehindu/2001/01/30/stories/05302523.htm> , accessed 8 March 2016.
- President Barack Obama Entertains India's PM Manmohan Singh, *The Telegraph*, 25 Nov 2009.
- Rajghatta, Chidanand, 'India, US Sign Defence Pact', *The Times of India*, June 29, 2005
- Rajghatta, Chidanand, 'Reagan and India: Great Expectations', *The Times of India*, June 6, 2004.
- Rashid, Harunur, 'Hillary goes to India', *The Daily Star*, Dhaka, July 23, 2009.
- Riedel, Bruce, 'An Uneasy Alliance: If the US Wants Out of Pakistan, it Must Turn Things Around With Pakistan', *Newsweek Pakistan*, September 13 & 20, 2010.
- Shahim, Sultan, 'Delhi Looses it Way on China Trade Route', *Asia Times*, July 23, 2004.

Singh, S. Nihal, 'India or Pak: Time for US to Choose', *Deccan Chronicle*, Hyderabad, India, March 25, 2010.

Solomon, Jay, 'U.S. Drops 'War on Terror' Phrase, Clinton Says', *Wall Street Journal*, March 31, 2009, available at <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB123845123690371231> accessed 1st December 2015.

The News, Islamabad, July 20, 2005.

Traub, James, 'Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Liberal? Conservative? Or Just Pat?', *The New York Times on the Web*, September 16, 1990.

US & India Sign 10-Year Defense Pact, *Defence Industry Daily*, June 30, 2005.

US Aims to Ease India-Pakistan Tension', *Wall Street Journal*, April 5, 2010.

US wants Indian Businesses to Create Jobs in America, *The Times of India*, Feb 18, 2010.

Wright, Robin, 'Top Focus Before 9/11 Wasn't on Terrorism', *The Washington Post*, 1st April 2004.

Other Sources – Reports, Seminar and Conference Papers

Abraham, Itty, 'Origins of the United States-India Nuclear Agreement', *East-West Centre Washington Working Papers*, No. 9, May 2007.

Annual Report, Indo-US Science & Technology Forum, April 2005 to March 2006.

Arabinda Acharya, *UNISCI Discussion Papers on The Second Bush Presidency: Priorities and Issues for Asia*, Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, January, 2005.

Ballingall, Chuck, *US Foreign Policy towards India*, Proposed Topic for the 2011-12 High School Policy Debate Topic for the National Federation of States High School Association, Damien High School, California.

Bhaskar Roy, 'President Obama's Asia Swing: Not Very Harmonious for South Asia', Paper No. 3516, *South Asia Analysis Group*, Noida, India, November 2009.

Black, Amy E., 'With God on Our Side: Religion in George W. Bush's Foreign Policy Speeches', paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association; Chicago, Illinois, September 2-5, 2004.

Blackwill, Robert D. and Chandra, Naresh, 'The United States and India: A Shared Strategic Future', *Joint Study Group Report*, Council on Foreign Relations and ASPEN Institute India, September 2011.

- Blackwill, Robert D., 'The Future of US-India Relations' *The RAND Corporation*, Speech hosted by the Confederation Of Indian Industries, New Delhi, May 5, 2009.
- Blank, Stephen J., 'Natural Allies? Regional Security in Asia and Prospects for Indo-American Strategic Cooperation', *Strategic Studies Institute*, U.S. Army War College, September 2005.
- Burgess, David, *The Indo-US Civilian Nuclear Agreement: The Tangle of Political Pressures, Security Concerns and Economic Interests Loosely Bound by Law*, available at https://www.reading.ac.uk/web/FILES/123agreement/David_Burgess.pdf, accessed 30 November 2015.
- Burns, William J., 'India's Rise and the Future of the US-India Relationship', Lecture delivered at *Council on Foreign Relations*, New York, 1 June, 2010.
- Burns, William J., 'India's Rise and the Promise of US-Indian Partnership', Remarks to the Council on Foreign Relations, June 1, 2010, available at <http://www.america.gov/st/texttransenglish/2010/june/2010060116565SblebahC0.5747906.html>.
- Campbell, Kurt and Andrews, Brian, 'Explaining the US Pivot to Asia', *The Asia Group*, Chatham House, August 2013.
- Chari, PR, 'India-US Relations: Promoting Synergy', *India & the World - Seminar Report*, Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, New Delhi, 6 March 2003.
- Cheng Ruisheng, 'Sino-Indian Relations: Sixty Years of Experience and Enlightenment', *IPCS Special Report*, 91, June 2010, Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, New Delhi.
- China's Supportive Stance on Kargil, Kashmir News Network, <http://ikashmir.net/kargil1999/china.html>.
- Cleveland, Harlan, 'American Foreign Policy: Learning to Lead A New', *Occasional Paper from the American Forum For Global Education*, No. 179, 2005.
- Cohen, Stephen P., 'India and America: An Emerging Relationship', A Paper Presented to the Conference on *The Nation-State System and Transnational Forces in South Asia*, December 8-10, 2000, Kyoto, Japan.
- Cohen, Stephen P., *The US and South Asia*, available at <http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/articles/2005/1/01southasia%20cohen/20050101.pdf>, accessed on 4 September 2014.
- Conry, Barbara, 'US 'Global Leadership': A Euphemism for World Policeman', *Policy Analysis*, No. 267, CATO Institute, February 1997. Available at <http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa267.pdf> accessed on 11 August 2015.

- Defense Cooperation with India - Expanding Again, Major Greg Winston, USA Office of Defense Cooperation, New Delhi, India, *The DISAM Journal*, Summer 2005.
- Dillon, Dana Robert, The United States and South Asia: An Assessment of appropriate US strategic objectives in South Asia, including an outline of the specific policy instruments, through which we should achieve our goals, Heritage Foundation, 2005.
- Futter, Andrew, 'The United States after Unipolarity: Obama's Nuclear Weapons Policy in a Changing World', *IDEAS reports - special reports*, Nicholas Kitchen (ed.), SR009, LSE IDEAS, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, 2011.
- Garrigues, Juan, 'Obama & Af-Pak: Exit from Afghanistan, Entry into Pakistan?' *FRIDE*, Comment, May 2009.
- Goel, MadanLal, 'Indo-American Relations in New Light', *Speech delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Indian Association of American Studies*, 1999.
- Grand, Camille, 'Obama's Foreign Policy: Is this Change We Can Believe In? European Perspective', European Security Forum, *ESF Working Paper*, No. 32, August 2009.
- Gupta, Amit, 'The US-India Relationship: Strategic Partnership and Complementary Interests?' *Strategic Studies Institute*, US Army War College, February, 2005.
- India and the World, *Panorama*, Synergy Study Point, Vol. 9, 2015, available at http://www.upscmantra.com/upsc_images/documents/Vol_9_Current_Events.pdf accessed on 24 Aug. 2015.
- India: Pro-America, Pro-Bush, *The Pew Research Center*, February 28, 2006, available at <http://pewglobal.org/commentary/display.php?AnalysisID=1002>
- Jaspal, Zafar Nawaz, 'The Indo-US Strategic Relationship and Pakistan's Security', *SASSI Research Report 9*, South Asian Strategic Stability Institute, London, December 2007.
- Jones, Steve, 'The Bush Doctrine: A Combination of Unilateralism and Preventive Warfare', available at <http://usforeignpolicy.about.com/od/defense/a/The-Bush-Doctrine.htm> accessed on 20 September 2015.
- Jones, Steve, 'US Foreign Policy After 9/11: Obvious Changes, Subtle Similarities', available at <http://usforeignpolicy.about.com/od/defense/a/Us-Foreign-Policy-After-9-11.htm> accessed on 20 September 2015.
- Joseph, Anil K., Sino-Indian Relations in Good Shape: Chinese Premier, *Rediff News*, June 26, 2006. <http://www.rediff.com/news/2006/jun/26china.htm>
- Joshi, Yogesh, 'Reluctant India, Rising China and Alliance Politics in the Asia-Pacific', *East-West Centre Asia Pacific Bulletin*, No. 162, April 26, 2012.

Judis, John B., *The Chosen Nation: The Influence of Religion on U.S. Foreign Policy*, *Policy Brief 37*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, March 2005.

Kanwal, Gurmeet, 'Indo-US Nuclear Deal: Implications for Non-proliferation', *SASSI Research Report 10*, South Asian Strategic Stability Institute, February 2008.

Karat, Prakash, 'The Indo-US Nuclear Deal: Struggle to Defend National Sovereignty', *The Marxist*, Vol. XXIII, No. 3, July to September, 2007, available at http://cpim.org/marxist/200703_marxist-nuclear%20deal-prakash.pdf , accessed 9 March 2016.

Karl F. Inderfurth, '*US-India Relations*' in *America's Role in Asia: Asian and American Views, Recommendations for US Policy From Both Sides of the Pacific*, The Asia Foundation, San Francisco. 2008.

Kennan and Containment, 1947 for details available at <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/kennan>

Khambatta, Persis and Sedler, Jesse, 'Update: US-India Strategic Dialogue: Progress, Problems, and Prospects', Center for Strategic and International Studies, June 11, 2012.

Khilani, Sunil, et. al, 'Non-alignmnen 2.0: A Foreign Policy for India in the Twenty First Century', 2012, at http://www.cprindia.org/sites/default/files/NonAlignment%2020_1pdf.

Lambert, Tim, *A Brief History of India*, available at <http://www.localhistories.org/india.html> accessed on 7 August 2015.

Latif, Shahibjada Ameer, 'US-India Counterterrorism Cooperation: Deepening the Partnership', *Statement Before the House Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Non-proliferation, and Trade*, Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Washington DC, September 2011.

Limaye, Satu P., *US-India Relations: Visible to the Naked Eye*, Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies.

Lyman, John, 'Obama's Multilateralism', *International Policy Digest*, 27 March 2011, available at <http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2011/03/27/obamas-multilateralism/>, accessed 30 November 2015.

Malik Qasim Mustafa, 'The Indo-US Nuclear Deal: An Overview of IAEA Safeguards and Nuclear Trade with NSG', paper presented at a Public Seminar on September 24, 2008, organised by the *Institute of Strategic Studies (ISS)*, Islamabad in collaboration with *South Asian Strategic Stability Institute (SASSI)*, UK.

Mehta, Ashok K., 'Indo-US Relations: The Way Ahead' *Strategy Research Project*, US Army War College, USAWC Class, 2008.

- Mohan, C. Raja, 'India-U.S. Relations: Modi and Obama Begin New Chapter', Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, available at <http://carnegieendowment.org/2015/01/29/india-us-relations-modi-and-obama-begin-new-chapter>, accessed on 10 November 2015.
- Mohan, C. Raja, 'Managing Multipolarity: India's Security Strategy in a Changing World', in India's Security Challenges at Home and Abroad', National Bureau of Asian Research *Special Report*, No. 39, May 2012.
- Muhammad, Adil Sultan, Indo-US Civilian Nuclear Cooperation: Implications on South Asian Security Environment, *The Henry L. Stimson Center*, July, 2006.
- Nayak, Polly, US Security Policy in South Asia Since 9/11- Challenges and Implications for the Future, *Asia Pacific Centre for Security Studies*, Occasional Paper Series, February 2005.
- Nayan, Rajiv, 'The Obama Administration and Nuclear Issues', *In Search of Congruence Perspectives on India-US Relations under the Obama Administration*, IDSA, New Delhi, 2010.
- Obama backs India on permanent UN Security Council seat, *BBC News*, 08 November 2010, available at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/mobile/world-south-asia-11711007>, accessed 12 March 2016.
- Obama's quote from Fareed Zakaria, 'The Strategist', 19 January 2012, available at <http://fareedzakaria.com/2012/01/19/the-strategist/>, accessed 5 December 2015.
- Onderjcsak, Robert, American Foreign and Security Policy under Barack Obama: Change and Continuity, available at <http://cenaa.org/analysis/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Ondrejcsak-pdf1.pdf>, accessed 13 December 2016.
- Paul, T.V., *India: Strategy and Foreign Policy in a Changing World*, paper presented at the Alexandre de Gusmao Foundation and IPRI Conference on India, Rio de Janeiro, August 28, 2008.
- President Reagan and American Foreign Policy, *A Special Booklet*, Chatham House, The Royal institute of International Affairs, London, January, 1981.
- Rajagopalan, Rajeswari Pillai, 'Indo-US Nuclear Deal: Implications for India & the Global N-Regime', *IPCS Special Report*, Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, No. 62, December 2008.
- Ranasinghe, Sergei DeSilva, 'Pakistan's Strategic and Foreign Policy Objectives', *Strategic Analysis Paper*, Future Directions international, 5 May 2011.
- Rice, Condoleezza, 'Building a New Relationship with India', *Defining Ideas*, Hoover Institution, November 3, 2011.
- Riedel, Bruce, 'India-US Counterterrorism Cooperation', *India-US Policy Memo*, September 2014, Brookings.

- Robert D. Blackwill and Naresh Chandra, 'The United States and India: A Shared Strategic Future', *Joint Study Group Report*, Council on Foreign Relations and ASPEN Institute India, September 2011.
- Robert D. Blackwill, 'The Future of US-Indian Relations', speech of July 2003 in New Delhi.
- Rothkopf, David, *National Insecurity: American Leadership in an Age of Fear*, Public Affairs, New York, 2014.
- Roundtable with Assistant Secretary of State Andrew Shapiro*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, April 24, 2012.
- Russia's Putin: Romney 'mistaken,' Obama 'honest', *NBC News*, Sep 6, 2012, available at <http://worldnews.nbcnews.com/news/2012/09/06/13705323-russias-putin-romney-mistaken-obama-honest>, accessed 10 March 2016.
- Sajjad, Mohammad Waqas and Hafeez, Mahwish, 'President Obama in India – A 'Giant Leap Forward'?' *Strategic Studies*, the Institute of Strategic Studies, Islamabad,
- Sen, Sukla, 'Indo-US Nuclear Deal: The Continuing Drift in India's Foreign Policy', *South Asia Citizens Web*, 20 September 2008, Ekta, Mumbai.
- Sial, Safdar, Pak-USA A Balance Sheet of Relations, Pak Institute for Peace Studies, *South Asia Net*, dated, June 26, 2007.
- Significant events in US Foreign Relations (1990-2001), eJournal USA: Foreign Policy Agenda, April 2006, US Department of State/ Bureau of International Information Program.
- Sinha, Yashwant, 'We Can Live without Nuclear Power', *Rediff News*, 2008, www.rediff.com
- Sir, John Thomson, 'Policy Paths in South Asia: Intersections between Global and Local', in, Michael R. Chambers (ed.) *South Asia in 2020: Future Strategic Balances and Alliances*, 2002.
- South Asia Monitor*, Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, Number 84, July 4, 2005.
- Stabilize South Asia, *Harvard International Review*, Winter 2010.
- Stolar, Alex, 'Non-Proliferation Ayatollahs or Thoughtful Scholars: Understanding the American Non-Proliferation Lobby', Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, India, 6 July 2006, available at <http://www.ipcs.org/article/us-south-asia/non-proliferation-ayatollahs-or-thoughtful-scholars-understanding-the-american-non-2062.html>, accessed 15 March 2016.
- Sud, Hari, 'India-US Nuclear Deal: The Benefits' *South Asia Analysis Group*, Paper No. 1740, March 20, 2006.

Sutter, Robert G., Brown, Michael E., and Adamson, Timothy J. A., with Mochizuki, Mike M. and Ollapally, Deepa, *Balancing Acts: The U.S. Rebalance and Asia-Pacific Stability*, Elliot School of International Affairs and Sigar Centre for Asian Studies of The George Washington University, August 2013.

Task Force Report on Delivering on the Promise: Advancing US Relations with India, Asia Society, January 2009.

Tasleem, Sadia, ‘Indo-US Nuclear Cooperation: Altering Strategic Positioning and Shifting Balance of Power in South Asia’, *RCSS Policy Studies 44*, Regional Centre for Strategic Studies, Colombo, 2008.

Tellis, Ashley J., ‘Engaging Pakistan: Getting the Balance Right’, *Foreign Policy for the Next President*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, September 2008.

Tellis, Ashley J., *Opportunities Unbound: Sustaining the Transformation in U.S.-Indian Relations*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington DC, 2013.

Tellis, Ashley, ‘Manmohan Singh Visits Washington: Sustaining US-Indian Cooperation and Differences’, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *Policy Brief 85*, November 2009.

The November 2009 US-India Political Action Committee position paper ‘US National Security and US-India Strategic Relations’.

The US-India Defence Relationship: An Update for President Obama’s State Visit to India, *NBR Workshop Report*, November 2010.

Tomiak, M. K., Did 9/11 Really Bring About a Revolution in America Foreign Policy?

United States, India Sign Open Skies Aviation Agreement, available at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/e/eeb/rls/prsrl/2005/44623.htm> , accessed 19 October 2015.

Watson, Rob, *Ambition marks Bush's second term*, available at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/4190019.stm>, accessed 11 October 2015.